THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

ary

PARL. PAPERS

FOR REFERENCE ONLY.

616938

THE

# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

## FOURTH SERIES

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

7 EDWARD VII.

## VOLUME CLXXIV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM TUESDAY, SEVENTH DAY OF MAY, 1907, TO WEDNESDAY, TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF MAY, 1907.

SIXTH VOLUME OF SESSION

1907.

---

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_may-7-29-1907_174

# CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

## HISTORY.

**CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.**

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

**REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.**

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35 .........41 GEO. III..........1801
— 36 .........42 — .........1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36 .........42 GEO. III. ......1802-3

## DEBATES.

### *First Series.*

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2...44 GEO. III.......1803-4
— 3 to 5...45 — ...... 1805
— 6 & 7...46 — ...... 1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9...47 GEO. III. ......1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11...48 GEO. III. ......1807-8
— 12 — 14...49 — ...... 1809
— 15 — 17...50 — ...... 1810
— 18 — 20...51 — ... 1810-11
— 21 — 23...52 — ...... 1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26...53 GEO. III. ... 1812-13
— 27 & 28...54 — ... 1813-14
— 29 to 31...55 — ... 1814-15
— 32 — 34...56 — ...... 1816
— 35 & 36...57 — ...... 1817
— 37 — 38...58 — ...... 1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40...59 GEO. III. ...... 1819
— 41 .........60 — ... 1819-20

### *Second Series.*

**REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.**

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 GEO. IV. ...... 1820
— 4 & 5... 2 — ...... 1821
— 6 — 7... 3 — ...... 1822
— 8 — 9... 4 — ...... 1823
— 10 — 11... 5 — ...... 1824
— 12 — 13... 6 — ......1825-6
— 14 — 15... 7 — ...... 1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 16 ......... 7 GEO. IV. ...... 1826
— 17 ......... 8 — ...... 1827
— 18 & 19... 9 — ...... 1828
— 20 — 21...10 — ...... 1829
— 22 to 25...11 — ... .. 1830

## ***Third Series.***

## REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

### (Ninth Parliament.)

Vol. 1 to 3... 1 Will. IV.......1830-1

### (Tenth Parliament.)

Vol. 4 to 8... 2 Will. IV. ...... 1832
— 9 — 14... 3 — ...... 1831

### (Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol. 15 to 20... 4 Will. IV....... 1833
— 21 — 25... 5 — ...... 1834

### (Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol. 26 to 30... 6 Will. IV....... 1835
— 31 — 35... 7 — ...... 1836
— 36 — 38... 8 — ...... 1837

## REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

### (Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 39 to 44... 1 Victoria ......1838
— 45 — 50... 2 — ......1839
— 51 — 55... 3 — ......1840
— 56 — 58... 4 — (a) 1841

### (Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 59 ......... 4 Victoria (b) 1841
— 60 to 65... 5 — ......1842
— 66 — 71... 6 — ......1843
— 72 — 76... 7 — ......1844
— 77 — 82... 8 — ......1845
— 83 — 88... 9 — ......1846
— 89 — 94...10 — (a) 1847

### (Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 95 ... ......10 Victoria (b) 1847
— 96 to 101...11 — ......1848
— 102 —107...12 — ......1849
— 108 —113...13 — ......1850
— 114 —118...14 — ......1851
— 119 —122...15 — (a) 1852

### (Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 123 .........15 Victoria (b) 1852
— 124 to 129...16 — ......1853
— 130 —135...17 — ......1854
— 136 —139...18 — ......1855
— 140 —143...19 — ......1856
— 144 ... ....20 — (a) 1857

### (Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol. 145 to 147...20 Victoria (b) 1857
— 148 —151...21 — ......1858
— 152 —153...22 — (a) 1859

### (Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 154 to 155...22 Victoria (b) 1859
— 156 —160...23 — ......1860
— 161 —164...24 — ......1861
— 165 —168...25 — ......1862
— 169 —172...26 — ......1863
— 173 —176...27 — ......1864
— 177 —180...28 — ......1865

### (Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol. 181 to 184...29 Victoria...... 1866
— 185 —189...30 — ......1867
— 190 —193...31 — ... 1867-8

### (Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol. 194 to 198...32 Victoria ... 1868-9
— 199 —203...33 — ......1870
— 204 —208...34 — ......1871
— 209 —213...35 — ......1872
— 214 —217...36 — ......1873

### (Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol. 218 to 221...37 Victoria ......1874
— 222 —226...38 — ......1875
— 227 —231...39 — ......1876
— 232 —236...40 — ......1877
— 237 —242...41 — ......1878
— 243 —249...42 — ... 1878-9
— 250 & 251...43 — (a) 1880

### (Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol. 252 to 256...43 Victoria (b) 1880
— 257 —265...44 — ......1881
— 266 —273...45 — (a) 1882
— 274 & 275...45 — (b) 1882
— 276 to 283...46 — ......1883
— 284 —292...47 — ......1884
— 293 —301...48 — ... 1884-5

### (Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol. 302 to 307...49 Victoria (a) 1886

### (Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol. 308 & 309...49 Victoria (b) 1886
— 310 to 321...50 — ......1887
— 322 —332...51 — ......1888
— 333 —340...52 — ......1889
— 341 —348...53 — ......1890
— 349 —356...54 — ... 1890-1

### *Fourth Series.*

(TWENTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vol. | 1 to 6 | 55 | VICTORIA | 1892 |

(TWENTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vol. | 7 | 56 | VICTORIA | 1892 |
| — | 8 to 21 | 57 | — | 1893-4 |
| — | 22 — 29 | 57 | — | 1894 |
| — | 30 — 35 | 58 | — | 1895 |

(TWENTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vol. | 36 | 59 | VICTORIA | 1895 |
| — | 37 to 44 | 59 | — | 1895-6 |
| — | 45 — 52 | 60 | — | 1897 |
| — | 53 — 65 | 61 | — | 1898 |
| — | 66 — 76 | 62 | — | 1899 |
| — | 77 | 63 | — | 1899 |
| — | 78 — 83 | 63 | — | 1900 |
| — | 84 | 63 & 64 | — | 1900 |
| — | 85 — 87 | 64 | — | 1900 |

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vol. | 88 | 64 | VICTORIA | 1900 |

### REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT—*cont.*

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vol. | 89 | 1 | EDWARD VII. | 1901 |
| — | 90 to 100 | 1 | — | 1901 |
| — | 101 | 1 & 2 | — | 1902 |
| — | 102 to 117 | 2 | — | 1902 |
| — | 118 to 128 | 3 | — | 1903 |
| — | 129 to 140 | 4 | — | 1904 |
| — | 141 to 151 | 5 | — | 1905 |

(TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vol. | 152 to 168 | 6 | EDWARD VII. | 1906 |
| Vol. | 169 to 174 | 7 | ,, ,, | 1907 |

# HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

## SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION, DECEMBER 1905.

### THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crewe.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
- Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
- Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
- Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
- War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
- India Office——Rt. Hon. John Morley, M.P.

First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon. Marquess of Ripon.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. R. McKenna, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, M.P
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt, M.P.

### NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Herbert Samuel, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——C. E. Hobhouse, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Portsmouth.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——Thomas Lough, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. E. Robertson, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——H. E. Kearley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——Dr. Macnamara, M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Walter Runciman, Esq., M.P
Financial Secretary to the War Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——
- J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
- Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
- Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
- J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Admiralty——
- Admiral of the Fleet Sir John Fisher.
- Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury
- Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. Jackson.
- Rear-Admiral F. S. Inglefield.

Army Council——
- The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
- General Hon. Sir N. G. Lyttelton (Chief of the General Staff).
- General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
- General Sir W. G. Nicholson (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
- Major-General Sir J. W. Murray (Master-General of the Ordnance).
- The Under Secretary of State for War.
- The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
- *Secretary.* The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——In the Cabinet.
Attorney-General——Sir J. Lawson Walton, M.P
Solicitor-General——Sir W. S. Robson, M.P.
Paymaster-General——R. K. Causton, Esq., M.P.

## OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Lord Steward——
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of ELIBANK, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount ALTHORP.
Vice-Chamberlain——WENTWORTH BEAUMONT, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of SEFTON.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of MANCHESTER.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl GRANVILLE.
- Earl of GRANARD.
- Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL.
- Lord ACTON.
- Lord DENMAN.
- Lord COLEBROOKE.
- Lord SUFFIELD.

Judge Advocate-General——T. MILVAIN, Esq., K.C.

## SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. JOHN SINCLAIR.
Lord High Constable——Earl of ERROL.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of BREADELBANE, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of ARGYLL, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord KINNAIRD.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord DUNEDIN.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. THOMAS SHAW, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Solicitor-General——ALEXANDER URE, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir STAIR AGNEW, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. LEACH, C.B., C.V.O

## IRELAND,

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. BIRRELL, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord HERSCHELL and WALTER CALLAN, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——The Earl of LIVERPOOL.
Controller——Major LAMBART.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice WALKER.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R. CHERRY, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——REDMOND BARRY, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord GRENFELL, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

# PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of Onslow.
Clerk of Parliaments——Sir Henry J. L. Graham, K.C.B.
Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. Thesiger, C.B.
Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——Edward Hall Alderson, Esq.
Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——Albert Gray, Esq.
Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. Harrison, Esq.
Senior Clerks——
  Clerk of the Journals——W. A. Leigh, Esq.
  Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq.
  Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. Skene, Esq.
  W. H. Hamilton Gordon, Esq.
  Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. Anstruther, Esq.
Other Clerks——Hon. A. McDonnell ; A. H. Robinson, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs) ; H. P. St. John, Esq. ; V. M. Biddulph, Esq. ; Hon. E. A. Stonor ; H. J. F. Badeley, Esq. ; C. Headlam, Esq. ; J. B. Hotham, Esq. ; E. C. Vigors, Esq. ; A. Tennyson, Esq. ; G. D. Luard, Esq. ; and G. Proby, Esq.
Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. A. Court, Esq.
Copyists——Mr. H. P. Norris and Mr. R. A. Court.
Messengers——Messrs. A. A. Worfell, C. E. Chizlett, J. W. F Locke, J. McMillan, G. Bennett, G. T. Philip, W. S. Wright.
Librarian——Edmund Gosse, Esq., LL.D.
Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. Butler, Esq.
Attendant——Mr. A. N. Stott.
Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. Campion, Esq. ; J. F. Symons Jeune, Esq. ; Clerk——H. C. Bramwell, Esq.
Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. Stephenson, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. Butler, M.V.O.
Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir Fleetwood I. Edwards, G.C.V.O., K.C B.
Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. Hand, Esq.
Resident Superintendent——J. K. Williams, Esq.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. Gurney Salter, Esq.
Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. Chandler, E. Fox, F. Holman.
First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. Walker, J. Hedley, J. Lane, B. Gallop.
Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. Strevens, G. W. Cross, W. Stopp.
Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. Woolacott, A. A. Edney, J. F. Baum.
Messengers——Messrs. A. J. Solman, C. Chapman, W. Phillips, W. W. Meates, T. Whitehead.
Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. Casbon.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. Palmer.
Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. Ridge.
Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. W. Bradshaw.

# PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir Courtenay Peregrine Ilbert, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
Clerk-Assistant——Arthur W. Nicholson, Esq.
Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. Webster, Esq.
Principal Clerks——
  Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. Gibbons, Esq., C.B.
  Clerk of the Journals——W. H. Ley, Esq.
  Committee Office——F. St. George Tupper, Esq.
  Private Bill Office——J. H. W. Somerset, Esq.
Senior Clerks——C. V. Frere, Esq. ; G. C. Giffard, Esq. ; Sir E. H. Doyle, Bart. ; S. L. Simeon, Esq. ; Arthur I. Dasent, Esq. ; Horace West, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——Henry A. Ferguson-Davie, Esq. ; Arthur H. Ellis, Esq. ; Percy A. Bull, Esq. ; F. R. Williams Wynn, Esq. ; W. E. Grey, Esq. ; F. C. Holland, Esq. ; J. W. G. Bond, Esq. ; H. C. Dawkins, Esq. ; R. P. Colomb, Esq. ; B. H. Fell, Esq. ; R. E. Childers, Esq. ; J. Scott Porter, Esq.
Junior Clerks——F. C. Bramwell, Esq. ; W. T. Legge, Esq. ; C. R. Turner, Esq. ; W. K. Gibbons, Esq. ; W. P. Johnston, Esq. ; J. Barlow, Esq. ; Hon. H. R. C. Balfour ; R. N. Bailey, Esq. ; G. F. M. Campion, Esq. ; S. De la Poer Beresford, Esq. ; H. S. Green, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. EDWARD GULLY, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. CHANDOS LEIGH, K.C., K.C.B
Trainbearer——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Messenger——Mr. W. HOLT.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE Esq
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
  Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
  Assistant Clerks——JOHN POYSER, Esq. ; W. K. SANDERSON, Esq.
  Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——R. C. WALPOLE, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq. Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART : Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN, W. HAGUE.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers ——
  Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
  Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURREY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H. HAMBLING.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON, Mr. G. WAINWRIGHT, Mr. J. GUYATT.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY, W. MACDONALD, W. R. BRIMSON.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY ; Assistant——Mr. W. BROADBENT ; Porters——Messrs. J. HART and G. FRY.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

# VOLUME CLXXIV.

## SIXTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1907.

### HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 7TH MAY, 1907.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

*Page*

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Rawtenstall Corporation; North-East London Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table. .. .. .. .. 1

**St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill** [H.L.]; Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1

**City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill** [H.L.].—The Order made on the 25th of April last, appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1

**Bristol Corporation Bill.**—Brought from the Commons, read $1^a$, and referred to the Examiners .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 2

**Midland Railway Bill** [H.L.]; York (Micklegate) Strays Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Cavehill and Whitewell Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Aberdeen Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over to-morrow .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 2

**Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill** [H.L.].—Read $2^a$ according to order .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 2

### *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.
No. 3774. United States (Chicago.)
No. 3775. Russia (Batoum and District.)
No. 3776. Turkey (Constantinople and District.)

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. 2

*May* 7.] *Pag*

College Charter Act, 1871.—Application from the right hon. Reginald McKenna, President of the Board of Education, for the establishment and incorporation of a college of Science and Technology at South Kensington, which has been referred by His Majesty in Council for the consideration and report of a Committee of His Majesty's Most Hon. Privy Council, together with a draft of the Charter applied for: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. 3

**Destructive Insects and Pests Bill** [H.L.].—Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment: and to be read 3ª on Monday next.

**House of Lord's (Reform) Bill** [H.L.]—Order of the day read for resuming the adjourned debate on the Amendment proposed by the Earl Cawdor to the Motion for the Second Reading, viz.—

> "To leave out all the words after 'that' for the purpose of inserting these words: 'A Select Committee to be appointed to consider the suggestions which have from time to time been made for increasing the efficiency of the House of Lords in matters affecting legislation, and to report as to the desirability of adopting them either in their original or in some modified form.'"

*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* .. .. .. .. .. 3
*The Duke of Devonshire* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 9
*The Earl of Rosebery* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 16
*Lord Courtney of Penwith* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 29
*The Marquess of Lansdowne* .. .. .. .. .. .. 31
*The Lord Privy Seal (The Marquess of Ripon)* .. .. .. 39
*Lord Newton* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 42

Motion for the Second Reading, and Bill (by leave of the House) withdrawn.

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the suggestions which have from time to time been made for increasing the efficiency of the House of Lords in matters affecting legislation, and to report as to the desirability of adopting them either in their original or in some modified form.—(*Earl Cawdor.*)

Amendment moved—

> "To leave out all the words after the word 'That' and to insert the words, 'in the opinion of this House it is not expedient to proceed with the discussion of various proposals for reforming the constitution of this House until provision has been made for an effective method of settling differences which may arise between this House and the other House of Parliament.'"—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 198; Not-Contents 46.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

**Irish Tobacco Bill** [SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*Lord Oranmore and Browne* .. .. .. .. .. .. 45

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Oranmore and Browne.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 7TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill**; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill.—Read the Third time, and passed .. .. .. 47

**Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill** (BY ORDER); Cardiff Railway Bill (by Order; Leith Harbour and Docks Bill (by Order).—Orders for Second Reading, read and discharged; Bills withdrawn .. .. .. .. 47

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Barnstaple, Coventry, Honiton, and Wallasey," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 178.] .. .. .. 47

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).—Mr. SOAMES reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at Two of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.. .. .. .. .. .. .. 47

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to:—London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill; Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill; Basingstoke Gas Bill; without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for transferring to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the endowments of the rectory of Sutton Coldfield, in the county of Warwick, and for providing for the re-endowment of the said rectory and for the application of the income and capital of the transferred endowments; and for other ecclesiastical purposes." [Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to consolidate, with amendments and additions, the provisions of the Acts relating to the Tees Valley Water Board." [Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords].

May 7.] Page

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to transfer the powers of the Kendal Fell Trustees to the Mayor, Alderman, and Burgesses of the borough of Kendal; to unite the townships within the borough into one parish; to abolish certain differential rating; and for other purposes." [Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to confer further powers on the Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board; to make the Bedwellty and Tredegar Urban District Councils constituent authorities; and for other purposes." [Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to authorise the Metropolitan Railway Company to establish and regulate a pension fund; and for other purposes." [Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords] .. .. 47

**Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill** [Lords]; Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 48

## PETITIONS.

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Forfar, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 48

Grocers' Licences (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Kirriemuir, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 48

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Kirriemuir, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 49

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Barry, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 49

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petitions against:—From Cottered; Cowley St. John; Forest Gate; Headon with Upton; Kensington; Lichfield; Windsor; and, Woolwich; to lie upon the Table .. .. 49

Pauper Lunatics (Cost of Maintenance).—Petitions for legislation:—From Leicester; and, Llanelly; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 49

Small Holdings (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Forfar, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 49

Weekly Rest Day Bill.—Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table . .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 49

## RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

National School Teachers' (Ireland) Pension Fund.—Return [presented 6th May]; to be printed. [No. 139] .. .. .. .. .. .. 49

College Charter Act, 1871 (College of Science at South Kensington.—Copy presented, of application received from the Board of Education for the establishment of a College of Science and Technology at South Kensington, referred by His Majesty in Council for the Consideration and Report of a Committee of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council; together with a Copy of the draft of the Charter applied for [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 49

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3774 to 3776 (by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 49

EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT).—Presented, reative thereto [Address 2nd May; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 140] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 50

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

REINSTATEMENT OF IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF PATRICK COLLINS.—Question, Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 50

TRANSFER OF POSTMAN THOMAS CONNOLLY, OF CASTLE ST., ANTRIM.—Question, Mr. V. Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. S. Buxton .. .. 50

APPOINTMENT TO BIRR POSTMASTERSHIP.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. S. Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. 51

POSTAL FACILITIES IN KILKENNY AND CASTLECOMER.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. 51

MERCHANT SHIPPING BILL—HEARING OF COUNSEL AT THE COMMITTEE STAGE. —Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 52

THE BANKRUPTCY OF THE BANKING CORPORATION, LIMITED.—Question, Mr. H. Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. 53

NAVAL OFFICERS AND THE CUSTOMS STAFF.—Question, Mr. Clynes (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 53

CAVAN LAND APPEAL CASES.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 54

ORDNANCE SURVEY TRAVELLING EXPENSES.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 54

NEW ARMY SCHEME AND THE PERMANENT STAFF OF THE AUXILIARY FORCES.—Question, Sir H. Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 55

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

NIGHT TRAINING ON WARSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. E. Robertson, Dundee) .. .. 55

ROYAL MARINE ARTILLERY AND LIGHT INFANTRY.—Question, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson .. .. .. .. .. 56

*May* 7.] *Page*

ROSYTH.—Questions, Mr. A. Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie), Mr. Watt (Glasgow College), Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyne); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 56

HORSES FOR THE ARMY.—Questions, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs), Mr. Lea (St. Pancras); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 57

WOOLWICH MECHANICS FOR GERMANY.—Questions, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answers, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. 57

MILITIA GARRISON ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 58

INDIAN BUDGET.—Questions, Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs), Mr. Ellis (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe), Sir C. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. C. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 58

PORT-OF-SPAIN TOWN COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland) land); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 59

EMIGRATION FROM THE WEST INDIA ISLANDS.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 60

NAIROBI PRISON.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Churchill 61

BRITISH INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 61

THE ASSOUAN DAM.—Questions, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool), Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Mr. J. Ward; Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 51

EGYPTIAN EXCISE DUTIES.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir E. Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. 63

SUNDAY CLOSING IN CAIRO.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir E. Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 63

EGYPTIAN DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir E. Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 63

EGYPT'S WESTERN FRONTIER.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir E. Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 64

AGRICULTURAL GRANT.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) .. .. .. .. .. .. 46

INCOME-TAX INCIDENCE.—Questions, Mr. Watt, Mr. A. Cross; Answers, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 65

GRANTS-IN-AID TO LOCAL AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. H. Banner (Liverpool, Everton); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. . 66

*May 7.*

*Page*

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT—NEW REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Hazel (West Bromwich); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 67

BAKER STREET AND WATERLOO RAILWAY—OVERCROWDING.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. 67

BOARD OF TRADE LABOUR COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. 68

VACCINATION DECLARATIONS.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 68

VALUATION BILL.—Question, Mr. C. Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. J. Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 69

SOUTH KENSINGTON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 69

VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM, SOUTH KENSINGTON.—Question, Sir W. Anson (Oxford University); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. 69

LLANELIAN SCHOOLMASTER'S SALARY.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 69

RE-DIRECTION OF LETTERS.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydeny Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 70

LIGHTING THE MALL.—Questions, Mr. C. Hay, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 70

BURWELL FARM.—Questions, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. H. Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answers, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir E. Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 71

CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. T. Shaw, Hawick Burghs) .. .. .. .. 71

WARDEN ESTATE EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) .. 72

ABBEYLEIX BOYCOTTING CASE.—Questions, Colonel McCalmont (Antrim, E.), Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answers, Mr. Cherry .. .. .. .. .. 72

ENNISNAG EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Cherry (for Mr. Birrell) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 73

POLICE PROTECTION OF GRAZING FARMS.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman; Answer, Mr. Cherry (for Mr. Birrell) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 73

IRISH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE FINES.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Cherry (for Mr. Birrell) .. .. .. .. .. .. 74

SLIGO COUNTY COUNCIL PRINTING CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. Liddell (Down, W.); Answer, Mr. Cherry (for Mr. Birrell) .. .. .. .. .. .. 75

May 7.]

Page

IRELAND AND THE BUDGET SURPLUS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 75

IRISH POSTAL STORES BRANCH.—Question, Mr. Meagher; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 76

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) .. .. .. .. .. .. 77

### *NEW BILLS.*

**Reformatory and Industrial Schools (No. 2) Bill.**—" To amend the Law as to Reformatory and Industrial Schools," presented by Mr. George Greenwood; supported by Sir John Kennaway, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Gooch, and Mr. Nicholson; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 179] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 77

**Fruit Growers (Scotland) Bill.**—" To amend the Law with respect to the classification of Fruit Growers Holdings in Scotland for purposes of rating; to include certain sections of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906; and for other purposes in respect of these holdings," presented by Mr. Menzies; supported by Mr. Molteno, Mr. Gulland, Major McMicking, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Beale, Mr. Dundas White, and Sir Thomas Glen Coats; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 180] .. 77

**Shops (No. 3) Bill.**—" To amend the Law relating to Shops," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; supported by Mr. Bowerman, Mr. Timothy Davies, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr. McCrae, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Alfred Scott, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Seddon, Mr. Tennant, and Mr. Wedgwood; to be read a second time upon Friday, 24th May, and to be printed. [Bill 181] .. .. .. 78

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.—Ordered, that Mr. Harold Cox be discharged from the Select Committee on Parliamentary Debates

Ordered, that Mr. Theodore Taylor be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. Whiteley*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 78

IRISH COUNCIL.

*The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.)* .. .. .. 78

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the Establishment and Functions of an Administrative Council in Ireland; and for other purposes connected therewith."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

*Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. 103
*Mr. John Redmond (Waterford)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 112
*Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe)* .. .. .. .. .. 128
*Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 130
*Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 144
*Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 146
*Sir Alfred Thomas (Glamorganshire, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. 153
*Mr. Gooch (Bath)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 154

Page
*Mr. Barrie* (*Londonderry, N.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 158
*Mr. Austin Taylor* (*Liverpool, East Toxteth*) .. .. .. .. 162
*Mr. James Campbell* (*Dublin University*) .. .. .. .. .. 167
*The Solicitor-General* (*Mr. Redmond Barry, Tyrone, N.*) .. .. .. 178
*Mr. Walter Long* (*Dublin, S.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 183

Mr. Birrell rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question put, " That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 417 ; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 161.)

Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 416 ; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 162.)

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Birrell, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

**Irish Council Bill.**—" To provide for the Establishment and Functions of an Administrative Council in Ireland ; and for other purposes connected therewith," presented accordingly, and read the first time ; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 182.]

And, it being half-past Eleven of the Clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at half after Eleven o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS : WEDNESDAY, 8th MAY, 1907.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) [H.L.] ; Worthing Gas.

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill :—Pasley Children Legitimisation—Petition for a Bill.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. 197

**Brecon and Merthyr Tydvil Junction Railway Bill** ; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1$^{a}$, and referred to the Examiners .. .. .... .. .. .. .. .. .. 197

**Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill** [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 197

*May* 8.] *Page*

**Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill.**—Read 2ª, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection .. .. .. .. .. 197

**Taff Vale Railway Bill.**—Read 2ª, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection .. .. .. .. .. 197

**London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill.**—Read 2ª, and committed for Tuesday next .. .. .. .. .. 197

**Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill.**—Read 2ª, and committed .. .. .. 197

**Swansea Harbour Bill.**—Read 2ª, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection .. .. .. .. .. .. 197

**Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill**; South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill; Brockenhurst Gas Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed .. 197

**Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynamman Railway Bill.**—Read 2ª, and committed; The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection .. 198

**United Methodist Church Bill** [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 198

**Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill** [H.L.].—Read 3ª; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons .. 198

**Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill** [H.L.].—Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Selsey Water Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons .. .. .. 198

**Falmouth Gas Bill.**—Read 3ª, and passed.. .. .. .. .. .. 198

**Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill.**—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons .. .. .. .. 198

*RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

JUDICIAL STATISTICS, ENGLAND AND WALES, 1905 (PART II.), CIVIL JUDICIAL STATISTICS.—Statistics relating to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the House of Lords, the Supreme Court of Judicature, County Courts, and other Civil Courts, edited by Sir John Macdonell, C.B., LL.D., a Master of the Supreme Court; presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 198

JOURNAL COMMITTEE.—Report from, that the One hundred and thirty-eighth Volume of the Journals (6th Edward VII., 1906), with an Index, was ready for delivery; read, and ordered to lie on the Table; and the said Volume ordered to be delivered in the same manner as the preceding Volumes of the Journals have been delivered .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 198

**Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill** [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*The Lord Chancellor* (*Lord Loreburn*) .. .. .. .. .. 199

Page

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

*The Earl of Halsbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 199
*The Lord Chancellor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 199

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next. [illegible]

**Prize Courts Bill** [H.L.] [Second Reading.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read. [illegible]

*The Lord Chancellor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 200

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 8TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Chelmsford and Merthyr Tydvil," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 183] .. .. .. .. 200

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Hertford, the Goole Joint Hospital District, and the Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 184] .. .. .. .. .. .. 200

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Bradford (Yorks), Northampton, and Wigan," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 185] .. .. 201

**Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill**, reported, with Amendments [Title amended].—Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. 201

### *PETITIONS.*

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill.—Petition from Lambeth, for alteration to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 201

*May* 8.] *Page*

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Hamilton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 201

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.—Petition from Lambeth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. 201

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Perth, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 201

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition against: From Frogmore; Hoxton; Shirbeck; and Small Heath; to lie upon the Table .. 201

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from Monmouth, for legislation; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 201

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from Coleford, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 201

SECONDARY ENDOWED SCHOOLS (SCHEMES).—Petition from Worcester, for inquiry; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 201

VACCINATION ACTS.—Petition from the Personal Rights Association for repeal; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 202

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

COLLEGE CHARTER ACT, 1871 (COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AT SOUTH KENSINGTON.)—Paper [presented 7th May] to be printed. [No. 141].. .. .. .. 202

JUDICIAL STATISTICS (ENGLAND AND WALES.)—Copy presented, of Judicial Statistics for England and Wales, 1905. Part II. (Civil Judicial Statistics), edited by Sir John Macdonnell, C.B., LL.D., Master of the Supreme Court [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.. .. .. .. .. .. 202

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES.)—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3777 and 3778 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 202

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BY LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Armitage (Leeds, Central); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. 202

SALARIES OF IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 203

SCOTTISH VALUATION BILL—DATE OF INTRODUCTION.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. 203

TELEGRAPHISTS AND CLERICAL DUTIES.—Question, Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. 204

PAY OF ESTABLISHED CHARGEMEN OF LABOURERS IN PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 204

*May* 8.]

*Page*

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE COMMISSION—ISSUE OF APPENDIX TO REPORT.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. 205

FOREIGN LEGISLATION ON GAMBLING IN OPTIONS AND FUTURES.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Kearley .. .. .. .. 205

VACCINATION BILL.—Compensation to Vaccination Officers.—Question, Sir William Bull (Hammersmith); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. 205

THE NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY INQUIRY COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. 206

PAYMENT OF INCOME TAX BY CO-OPERATIVE TRADING SOCIETIES.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. 206

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

OBSOLETE WARSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. E. Robertson, Dundee) .. .. .. 207

ARMY STORES FOR SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 207

ARMY BILLETS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 208

CONVERSION OF RIFLES.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 208

DISTURBANCES IN EASTERN BENGAL.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham E.), Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. .. .. .. .. 209

SIR S. J. MACKAY'S SPEECH ON INDIA AND PREFERENTIAL TARIFFS.—Question, Mr. H. Banner (Liverpool, Everton), Sir H. Vincent (Sheffield, Central), Sir H. Cotton, Sir G. Doughty (Great Grimsby); Answer, Mr. Morley .. 210

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE REPORTS.—Question, Sir H. Vincent, Mr. P. Pease (Darlington), Mr A. Lea (Hampshire, Fareham), Mr. Arkwright; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.), The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs), The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire E.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 211

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE AND IRISH HOME RULE.—Question, Mr. Walker (Leicestershire, Melton); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. 214

SIR ALEXANDER SWETTENHAM.—Question, Mr. Haddock (Lancashire, North Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. Churchill and The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) .. .. .. .. .. .. 214

COTTON GROWING IN BRITISH EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Courthope, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. 215

TRADE WITH THE VOLTA DISTRICT.—Question. Mr. Higham (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. 216

*May* 8.] *Page*

ST. LUCIE RIOTS.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 215

WARSHIPS IN WEST INDIAN WATERS.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 217

NEW HEBRIDES—FEMALE LABOUR.—Question, Sir B. Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. 217

JAMAICA EARTHQUAKE—GOVERNMENT GRANTS.—Question, Mr. O. C. Phillips (Pembroke and Haverfordwest); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. 218

LABOUR ON THE RAND.—Question, Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 218

INCOME TAX REFUNDS.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 218

NATURALISATION FEES.—Question, Mr. S. Samuel (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 219

CRIMES BY ALIENS.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 219

CRIME IN LINCOLNSHIRE.—Questions, Mr. J. Roche (Galway, E.); Sir B. Sheffield, Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.), Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory), Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answers, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. 219

POLICE PROMOTION REGULATIONS, CUMBERLAND.—Question, Sir H. Vincent; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 220

STEPNEY PARLIAMENTARY REGISTER.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 221

COMPULSORY WEIGHING IN THE IRON AND STEEL TRADES.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 221

WAGES IN THE ENGLISH COTTON TRADE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 221

VALUE OF IMPORTS FOR THE COLONIES.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Kearley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 222

EXPORTS TO BRITISH GARRISONS ABROAD.—Question, Mr. Remnant; Answer, Mr. Kearley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 222

LONDON LOCAL TAXATION RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. J. Burns, Battersea) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 222

LONDON ELECTORAL LISTS.—Question, Mr. Dickinson; Answer, Mr. J. Burns 223

GLASGOW TELEPHONE EMPLOYEES.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 224

*May* 8.] *Page*

RELIGIOUS TESTS IN TRAINING COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. Henry (Shropshire, Wellington); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouth, N.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 224

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 224

FOREIGN TRAWLERS IN THE MORAY FIRTH.—Question, Mr. S. Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness); Answer, Sir G. Doughty (Grimsby) .. 225

IRISH LAND COURT RECEIVERS.—Questions, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath), Mr. Flavin; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. .. 226

BURROWES ESTATE AGREEMENTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 226

IRISH LAND PURCHASE ARREARS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 227

IRISH TENANTS' RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 228

DINGLE HARBOUR.—Question, Mr. T. O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 228

ARMAGH BOGS BETTERMENT.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 229

LORD INCHIQUIN AND HIS TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 230

ROSCOMROE GRAZING FARM DISPUTE.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid), Mr. Reddy; Answers, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 230

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 231

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Flynn; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 235

SHILLELAGH BENCH OF MAGISTRATES.—Question, Mr. J. O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 236

LAND PURCHASE IN WICKLOW—CASE OF THOMAS WHELAN.—Question, Mr. J. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 237

GRAZING FARMS—PROTECTION FOR OCCUPIERS.—Question, Mr. Arkwright; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 238

IRISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE—TRAVELLING VETERINARY INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. Delany; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 238

IRISH FINANCE.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 239

SWINFORD GUARDIANS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye): Answer. Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 239

IRISH LAND PURCHASE FRAUDS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 240

*May* 8.]

Page

IRISH BOARD OF WORKS.—Questions, Mr. Delany, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 240

IRISH LAND ACT—TREASURY RULES.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 241

CARNDONAGH MAILS.—Question, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 241

MARRIAGE AND HEREDITARY DISEASE.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 242

BUTTER BILL.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 242

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Questions, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. 242

ILLEGAL FISHING PROSECUTIONS IN SCOTLAND.—Questions, Sir G. Doughty (Great Grimsby), Mr. S. Wilson); Answer. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 243

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Munro Ferguson; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Stewart-Smith.
Report to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 244

*NEW BILLS.*

**Primogeniture Bill**.—"To alter the Law relating to the descent of land upon an Intestacy," presented by Mr. Arnold Herbert; supported by Mr. Micklem, Mr. Evans, Mr. Stewart-Smith, Mr. Stanger, Mr. Napier, Sir Albert Spicer, Mr. Herbert Craig, and Mr. Haworth; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 4th June, and to be printed. [Bill 186] .. .. .. .. 244

**Restraint of Trade (Shops) Bill**.—"To render null and void certain provisions in shop assistants' agreements," presented by Mr. Seddon; supported by Mr. Frederick Edwin Smith, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Scott, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Price, and Mr. Clement Edwards; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 5th June, and to be printed. [Bill 187] .. .. .. .. 244

**Sunday Trading (Scotland) Bill**.—"To regulate and control Sunday Trading in Scotland, presented by Mr. Cameron Corbett; to be read a second time, upon Wednesday, 5th June, and to be printed. [Bill 188] .. .. .. 245

**Petty Session Clerks (Ireland) Bill.** "To amend the Law relating to Clerks of Petty Sessions in Ireland," presented by Mr. Sloan; supported by Mr. Wolff, Mr. Crean and Mr. Flynn; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 189] .. .. .. .. .. .. 245

WAYS AND MEANS [24TH APRIL] REPORT.—Order read, for further Consideration of First Resolution, "That Income-tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound."

*Mr. Samuel Roberts* (*Sheffield, Ecclesall*) .. .. .. .. .. 245
*Mr. Fell* (*Great Yarmouth*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 246

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'one shilling,' and insert the words 'elevenpence,'"—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts*)—instead thereof:

Question proposed, "That the words 'one shilling,' stand part of the said Resolution."

*The Chancellor of the Exchequer* (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) .. .. 247
*Mr. Harmood-Banner* (*Liverpool, Everton*) .. .. .. .. .. 249
*Mr. Everett* (*Suffolk, Woodbridge*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 251
*Mr. George Faber* (*York*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 253
*Mr. Rees* (*Montgomery Boroughs*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 254
*Sir F. Banbury* (*City of London*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 255
*Mr. Alexander Cross* (*Glasgow, Camlachie*) .. .. .. .. 258
*Sir J. Jardine* (*Roxburghshire*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 260
*Sir Thomas Lowe* (*Birmingham, Edgbaston*) .. .. .. .. 261
*Mr. Myer* (*Lambeth, N.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 262
*Mr. A. J. Balfour* (*City of London*) .. .. .. .. .. 262

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 323; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 163.)

Resolution agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS [24TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for Consideration of Second and Subsequent Resolutions.

Resolutions considered.

Second Resolution.

May 8.] Page

ESTATE DUTY.

2. " That in the case of persons dying on or after the nineteenth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, the rates of Estate duty under section seventeen of The Finance Act, 1894, be amended so that—

| Where the Principal Value of the Estate. | | | | Estate Duty shall be payable at the rate per cent. of | Instead of |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Exceeds— | | | | | |
| £ | | | £ | | |
| 150,000 | and does | not exceed | 250,000 | Seven pounds - - - | Six pounds ten shillings |
| 250,000 | ,, | ,, | 500,000 | Eight pounds - - | Seven pounds |
| 500,000 | ,, | ,, | 750,000 | Nine pounds - - - | Seven pounds ten shillings |
| 750,000 | ,, | ,, | 1,000,000 | Ten pounds - - - | Seven pounds ten shillings |
| 1,000,000 | ,, | ,, | 1,500,000 | Ten pounds on one million and eleven pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |
| 1,500,000 | ,, | ,, | 2,000,000 | Ten pounds on one million and twelve pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |
| 2,000,000 | ,, | ,, | 2,500,000 | Ten pounds on one million and thirteen pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |
| 2,500,000 | ,, | ,, | 3,000,000 | Ten pounds on one million and fourteen pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |
| 3,000,000 | - - - | - - | - | Ten pounds on one million and fifteen pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |

Read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

*Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 267
*Mr. Harold Cox (Preston)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 268

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 329 ; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 164.)

Third Resolution—

INCOME-TAX (INCLUSION OF ALL OFFICES AND EMPLOYMENTS IN SCHEDULE E).

3. " That the Income-tax charged on offices or employments of profit, whether public or not, be charged under Schedule E in The Income-Tax Act, 1853."

Disagreed to.

Resolutions—

INCOME-TAX (LIMITATION ON THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF DEDUCTIONS OR REPAYMENTS FOR WEAR AND TEAR).

4. " That no deduction or repayment be allowed in any year in respect of the diminished value, by reason of wear and tear, or any machinery or plant which, when added to the deductions or repayments allowed on that account in previous years, will make the aggregate amount of the deductions or repayments exceed the actual cost of the machinery or plant."

INCOME-TAX (ABOLITION OF REPAYMENTS IN RESPECT OF ASSESSMENT ON AVERAGE INCOME).

5. " That any abatement, relief, or repayment of Income-Tax under section one hundred and thirty-three of The Income-Tax Act, 1842, as amended by section six of The Revenue Act, 1865, shall cease."

INCOME-TAX (ASSESSMENT ON TRADES, ETC., RECENTLY COMMENCED).

6. " That Income-tax charged under Schedule D in The Income-Tax Act, 1853, on professions, trades, or vocations shall, in the case of professions, trades, or vocations which have been set up or commenced within the three years on which the average income is to be computed under The Income-Tax Acts or within the year of assessment, be charged with preference to the actual profits or gains arising in the year of assessment."

Agreed to.

Ordered " That it be an Instruction to the Gentlemen appointed to bring in a Bill upon the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on the 1st day of this instant May, and then agreed to by the House, that they do make provision therein pursuant to the Resolutions agreed to by the House this day."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

LOCAL TAXATION GRANTS [CONSOLIDATED FUND].

Resolution reported, " That it is expedient that the following grants to Local Taxation Accounts, namely—(1) The Estate Duty grants paid under section nineteen of The Finance Act, 1894 ; and (2) The Agricultural Rates grant paid under section two of the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896 ; and (3) The Scottish Agricultural Rates grant paid under section three of The Agricultural Rates, Congested Districts, and Burgh Land Tax Relief (Scotland) Act, 1896, instead of being paid out of the revenues out of which they are payable under the present law, be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Fund, but in the case of the grants which are payable during the continuance of any temporary Act, only so long as that Act is continued, and that where under the present law the proceeds of any duties are paid to any local taxation account, a sum equal to the proceeds of those duties at their present rates be paid to that account out of the Consolidated Fund, and the actual proceeds of the duties be paid into the Exchequer."

*Mr. Hicks Beach* (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) .. 274
*Mr. Harmood-Banner* .. 275
*Mr. Asquith* .. 276

Resolution agreed to.

Ordered, That it be a further Instruction to the Gentlemen appointed to bring in a Bill upon the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on the 1st day of this instant May, and then agreed to by the House, that they do make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

**Finance Bill.**—" To grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue. to alter other Duties, and to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue and the National Debt, and to make other provisions for the financial arrangements of the year," presented, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 190.]

**Post Office Sites Bill.**

*The Postmaster-General* (*Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar*) .. 278

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Sir F. Banbury* (*City of London*) .. 278
*Lord R. Cecil* (*Marylebone, E.*) .. 279
*Mr. William Rutherford* (*Liverpool, West Derby*) .. 279
*Mr. Sydney Buxton* .. 279
*Mr. Rawlinson* (*Cambridge University*) .. 280

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Five Members. Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, " That all Petitions against the Bill presented Five clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee ; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill."

Ordered, " That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records."

Ordered, " That Three be the Quorum."—(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

**Butter and Margarine Bill.**—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [17th April], " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

*Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool)* .. .. .. .. .. 280
*Lord Willoughby de Eresby (Lincolnshire, Horncastle)* .. .. .. 281
*Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie)* .. .. .. .. 281

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

**Criminal Appeal Bill.**—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University)* .. .. .. .. .. 282
*Mr. Clavell Salter (Hants, Basingstoke)* ... .. .. .. .. 286

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the word ' now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words ' upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, " That the word ' now ' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. 293

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

*The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.)* .. .. .. 293
*Mr. S. T. Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid)* .. .. .. .. .. 293

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

**Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill.**—Order for Second Reading read.

*The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland)* .. .. .. .. .. 294

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 295
*Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 295
*Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 296
*Mr. Stuart Wortley (Sheffield, Hallam)* .. .. .. .. .. 296
*Mr. Maclean (Bath)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 297
*Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby)* .. .. .. .. .. 297
*Mr. Rawlinson* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 298

*May* 8.] Page

*Mr. Herbert Samuel* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 298
*Mr. S. T. Evans* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 299
*Mr. Crooks (Woolwich)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 299

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE.—Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to examine the publications printed by order of this House or presented to it through Public Departments, and to call attention to any case in which unnecessary expense has been incurred.

Mr. Cleland, Mr. Harold Cox, Mr. Crombie, Mr. William Jones, Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh, Mr. Maddison, Mr. Compton Rickett, Mr. George Roberts, and Mr. Toulmin nominated Members of the Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the Quorum.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*) .. .. .. 300

Public business having been concluded at ten minutes past Eight o'clock, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until a quarter-past Eight o'clock.

RURAL DEPOPULATION—

*Mr. Rogers (Wiltshire, Devizes)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 300
*Mr. Walker (Leicestershire, Melton)* .. .. .. .. .. 308

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the progressive decline of population in rural districts is a subject of serious national concern, and that this House ought at once to take such action, legislative and administrative, as will maintain a rural population as a reservoir of national strength and a necessary condition of national well-being."—(*Mr. Rogers.*)

*Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton)* .. .. .. .. 314
*Mr. Black (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade)* .. .. .. .. .. 315
*Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 316
*Sir Francis Channing (Northamptonshire, E.)* .. .. .. .. 317
*Mr. Parker (Halifax)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 318
*Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 319
*Mr. Beck (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech)* .. .. .. .. .. 321
*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport)* .. .. .. .. 322
*The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.)* 324
*Mr. Hicks-Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury)* .. .. .. .. 331

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That the progressive decline of population in rural districts is a subject of serious national concern, and that this House ought at once to take such action, legislative and administrative, as will maintain a rural population as a reservoir of national strength and a necessary condition of national well-being.—(*Mr. Rogers.*)

**Notification of Births Bill.**—Read a second time and committed to a Standing Committee .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 332

Adjourned at seven minutes after Eleven o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 9TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Great Northern and City Railway Bill.**—Read the third time, and passed 333

**King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill.**—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. 333

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.**—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow .. .. .. .. .. 333

**London County Council (Money) Bill**; Middlesborough Corporation Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 333

**Leeds Corporation Bill.**—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. .. 333

**Birmingham Corporation Bill** [LORDS]; Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 333

**Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill** [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 333

Bill to be read the third time.

**Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill** [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 333

Bill to be read the third time.

**Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill.**—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. 333

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 5).—Sir LEWIS MCIVER reported from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parites, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 334

*May* 9.] *Page*

## *PETITIONS.*

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Dunfermline, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 334

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour; From Anniesland; and, Cross; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 334

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petitions against; From Bristol; Harston; and, Leamington Spa; to lie upon the Table .. .. 334

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from Prestwich, for legislation; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 334

JAMAICA.—Petition of Residents in the City of Kingston and the adjoining Parish of St. Andrew, Jamaica, for a grant in aid and for an Imperial loan to restore homes and buildings destroyed in the recent earthquake (King's recommendation signified); referred to the Committee of Supply 334

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

EAST INDIA (EXCISE COMMITTEE).—Return [presented 6th May], to be printed. [No. 142] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 334

TEINDS, ETC. (SCOTLAND).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th December, 1906; *Mr. McCallum*]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 334

MINES AND QUARRIES.—Copy presented, of General Report and Statistics for the year 1906, Part I. (District Statistics), Statistics of the Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the United Kingdom, arranged according to the Inspection districts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 334

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Lancaster, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Clayton-le-Moors, Oswaldtwistle, and Church Urban Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 335

CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1907-8).—Estimate presented, of the Further Amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1908, for Sundry Colonial Services [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 143] .. .. .. .. .. 335

EAST INDIA (ESTIMATE).—Copy presented, of Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India for 1906–7, compared with the results of 1905–6 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 144] 335

EAST INDIA (FINANCE AND REVENUE ACCOUNTS).—Copy presented, of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1905–6 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 335

EAST INDIA (HOME ACCOUNTS).—Copy presented of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 145] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 335

*May* 9.]

*Page*

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3799 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 335

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—

1. Lunacy, Copy of Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the Visitors of Lunatics between 1st October, 1906, and 31st March, 1907 [by Act].

2. Charity Commissioners (Agricultural Land), Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th March; *Sir William Collins*] .. .. 335

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION WORKS).—Address for "Return showing the estimated position, as regards capital expenditure, of the several Railways and Irrigation Works under construction in India on the 31st day of March, 1907, and the proposed expenditure thereon during 1907-8 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 155, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Robert Price*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 336

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS—Address for. Return showing the number of Experiments on Living Animals during the year 1906, under licences granted under the Act 39 and 40 Vic., c. 77, distinguishing the nature of the Experiments (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 204, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel*) .. .. .. .. .. 336

ULTIMUS HÆRES (SCOTLAND) (ACCOUNT AND LIST OF ESTATES).—Return ordered, "of Abstract Account of the receipts and payments of the King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Scotland, in the year ended the 31st day of December, 1906, in the administration of Estates and Treasure Trove on behalf of the Crown."

"And of Alphabetical List of Estates which fell to the Crown as Ultimus Hæres in Scotland administered by the King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in the same year."—(*Mr. Runciman*) .. .. .. 336

GAS UNDERTAKINGS.—Return ordered, "relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom, other than those of Local Authorities, for the year ended the 31st day of December 1906 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 393, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*) .. .. 336

GAS UNDERTAKINGS (LOCAL AUTHORITIES).—Return ordered, "relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom, belonging to Local Authorities for the year ended the 25th day of March, 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 394, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George*) 336

AMERICAN MAIL SERVICE.—Return ordered, "showing the number of days, hours, and minutes occupied in the transit of the Royal Mails, both outward and inward, carried during the years 1905 and 1906, respectively, by steamships between Queenstown and New York, between Southampton and New York, and between New York and Plymouth. The Return to specify the names of the steamers and to indicate by asterisk or otherwise those not carrying mails under contract (in continuation of similar Return for 1904, dated May, 1905)."—(*Captain Donelan*) .. .. .. .. 337

IRISH LOCAL AUTHORITIES AND LOCAL TRADERS' TENDERS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 337

*May* 9.] Page

FLEET RESERVE MEN AND FOREIGN NAVIES.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. 338

ADVERTISING OF VACANCIES FOR POSTMASTERSHIP.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. S. Buxton .. .. .. .. 338

GRANT FOR LABOURERS SCHEME IN THE DUNSHAUGHLIN UNION.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 339

REINSTATEMENT OF EVICTED TENANTS ON THE ESTATE OF CAPTAIN FITZGATE, COUNTY LOUTH.—Question, Mr. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 339

BELFAST CORPORATION AND CAVEHILL TRAMWAYS.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 340

HEARING OF LAND CASES IN THE DINGLE DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. Thomas O Donnell (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 341

PROMOTION IN THE CUSTOMS SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 341

ANNUAL LEAVE OF ASSISTANT CLERKS IN THE CUSTOMS (STATISTICAL BRANCH).—Question, Mr. S. Collins (Lambeth, Kennington); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 343

LOSS OF H.M.S. "ARIEL"—DATE OF COURT-MARTIAL.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. E. Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 343

AGE OF GERMAN NAVAL RECRUITS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. E. Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 343

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF SCHOOLS.—Question, Viscount Valentia (Oxford); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 344

REPAYMENT OF EXCHEQUER BONDS.—Question, Mr. Ashton (Bedfordshire, Luton); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 344

INDIAN RAILWAYS—SHORTAGE OF ROLLING STOCK.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. 345

MANSION IN THE HANDS OF THE IRISH ESTATE COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Sir J. Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 345

INSPECTION OF THE DARNLEY ESTATE, COUNTY MEATH.—Question, Mr. Sheehy; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 346

SALE OF MR. PHILPOT'S ESTATE, COUNTY MEATH.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 346

PURCHASE OF THE ESTATE OF ARCHDEACON SCOTT, COUNTY MEATH.—Question, Mr. P. White (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 347

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF JONATHAN DANN.—Question, Mr. P. White; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 347

SALARY OF MR. J. T. DRENNAN.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 348

Page

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY FORCE FUNDS.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 348

ARMY PENSIONS—CASE OF HUGH CRAIG.—Question, Mr. W. Benn (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Haldane 348

ARMY PENSIONS—CASE OF S. LISLE.—Question, Mr. W. Benn; Answer, Mr. Haldane 349

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

SALE OF OBSOLETE WARSHIPS. Questions, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College), Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan), and Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. E. Robertson, Dundee) 349

DANGEROUS DERELICTS AT SEA.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 350

ROSYTH.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 351

NAVAL CONTRACTS FOR BEER.—Question, Sir F. Banbury (City of London); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 351

COUNTY ASSOCIATIONS—AUDIT OF ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, the Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 352

COMPULSORY DRILL IN SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Bright (Oldham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 352

FREIGHT TO THE WEST COAST OF AFRICA.—Questions, Mr. Wedgwood, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 352

NIGERIAN RAILWAYS—FREIGHTS OF MATERIAL.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood; Answer, Mr. Churchill 354

WEST AFRICAN DEEP-WATER LANDING PLACES.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood; Answer, Mr. Churchill 354

NEW TRANSVAAL LOAN.—Question, Sir J. Leese (Lancashire, Accrington), Mr. Dalziel (Kirkcaldy Burghs); Answer, Mr. Churchill 355

DISTURBANCES IN MOROCCO.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Sir E. Grey (Northumberland, Berwick) 356

THE ODDFELLOWS AND LAND TAX.—Question, Mr. Thornton (Clapham); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Asquith (Fife, E.) 356

PADDINGTON BOROUGH COUNCILS AND HOME WORKERS.—Question, Mr. C. Money (Paddington, N.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 357

PRIVILEGED CABS.—Question, Mr. C. Money, Mr. Wiles (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 357

*May* 9.]

Page

THE ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS.—Question, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 358

MISSING VESSELS AND DERELICTS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvonshire Boroughs) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 358

TRADE WITH SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 359

RAILWAY COMPANIES AND LUGGAGE INSURANCE.—Question, Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. 359

SWINDON GUARDIAN'S DISQUALIFICATION.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. J. Burns, Battersea) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 360

COMMONS AND RIGHTS OF WAYS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney, Shetland); Answer, Mr. J. Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. 360

WEST LONDON CENTRAL WESTBOURNE GROVE.—Question, Mr. C. Money; Answer, Mr. J. Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 361

MALTON RURAL DISTRICT WATER SUPPLY.—Question, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, Mr. J. Burns .. .. .. .. .. 361

MOTOR 'BUS SMOKE.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. J. Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 362

THE POST OFFICE AND LETTER CIRCULARS.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. S. Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 362

BOARD OF EDUCATION AND MEDICAL INSPECTORS OF SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. J. R. Macdonald (Leicester), Mr. Wedgwood; Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) .. .. .. 363

NOMENCLATURE FOR NON-PROVIDED SCHOOLS—SHIPTON NATIONAL SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipton); Answer, Mr. McKenna 364

NOMENCLATURE FOR NON-PROVIDED SCHOOLS—"CHURCH OF ENGLAND SCHOOLS."—Question, Mr. Clough; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. 365

GRANTS TO UNIVERSITY COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) .. .. 366

REPORT OF INSPECTORS OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGES.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 366

WEST RIDING SECONDARY SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.—Question, Mr. Nussey (Pontefract); Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Sir H. Fowler (Wolverhampton, W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 367

SCUDAMORE CHARITY FOR DECAYED MEN AT HEREFORD.—Question, Mr. T. F. Richards (Wolverhampton, W.); Answer, Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 367

*May* 9.] Page

WHALE KILLING AND THE HERRING FISHERY.—Question, Mr. C. Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 368

HOUSE LETTING IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 369

SCOTTISH ESTIMATES.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 369

BARGARAN RAFFLES IN SCOTLAND.—Questions, Mr. Watt, Mr. Sutherland (Elgin Burghs), Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central); Answer, The Lord Advocate, Mr. T. Shaw (Hawick Burghs) .. .. .. .. 371

LEITRIM EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF JAMES DALY.—Question, Mr. T. F. Smyth (Leitrim, S.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 371

LORD GOUGH'S GORT ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 372

UNECONOMIC HOLDINGS NEAR GORT.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 372

GALWAY POOR RATE COLLECTORS.—Question, Mr. Duffy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 373

IRISH COUNCIL BILL GRANT.—Question, Captain Waring (Banffshire); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 373

COUNTY CLARE—DEDUCTIONS FROM PARLIAMENTARY GRANTS.—Question, Mr. W. Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. 374

BALLINSPITTLE MAILS.—Question, Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 374

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill); Mr. Secretary Gladstone and Mr. Herbert Samuel; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill): Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Kearley.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee: That they had added to Standing Committee A the following fifteen Members in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill: Sir William Holland, Mr. Holden, Mr. Isaacs, Sir Andrew Torrance, Mr. Beale, Mr. Raphael, Major Dunne, Mr. George Greenwood, Sir William Hornby, Mr. Brotherton, Colonel Warde, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. Nicholls, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Haviland-Burke.

Reports to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 374

*NEW BILL.*

**Teachers of Music Registration Bill.**—"To provide for the Registration of Teachers of Music," presented by Mr. O'Neill; supported by Sir John Brunner, Sir Henry Craik, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, and Mr. George White; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 191] 375

*May* 9.] Page

SUPPLY [8TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.—Revenue Departments.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs."

*The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 375
*Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury)* .. .. .. .. .. 388
*Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs)* .. .. .. .. .. 391

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Annan Bryce.*)

*Sir F. Banbury (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. 392
*Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 395
*Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs)* .. .. .. .. .. 397
*Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend)* .. .. .. .. .. 398
*Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton)* .. .. .. .. .. 400
*Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire)* .. .. .. .. .. 402
*Mr. Wilkie (Dundee)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 403
*Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 405
*Mr. Staveley-Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford)* .. .. .. .. 406
*Mr. Morton (Sutherland)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 407
*Col. Lockwood (Essex, Epping)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 410
*Mr. MacLean (Bath)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 412
*Mr. Sydney Buxton* .. .. .. .. .. .. 413
*Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland)* .. .. .. .. 419
*Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 421
*Mr. Fell (Gt. Yarmouth)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 422
*Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire)* .. .. .. .. .. 422
*Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 423
*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.)* .. .. .. .. 423
*Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 424
*Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 425
*Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs)* .. .. .. .. .. 426
*Mr. Sydney Buxton* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 427

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

*May* 9.] *Page*

**London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill** [By Order].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time." ..

*Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye)* .. 429
*Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.)* .. 432

Amendment proposed.—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question.'"

*Mr. Wood (Glasgow, St. Rollox)* .. 433
*Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Strand, Westminster)* .. 436
*Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.)* .. 439
*Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.)* .. 441
*Mr. Bowerman (Deptford)* .. 442
*Mr. Waterlow (Islington, N.)* .. 444
*Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich)* .. 446
*The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs)* .. 450
*Mr. Crooks (Woolwich)* .. 453
*Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.)* .. 454
*Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent)* .. 458

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next, at a quarter past Eight of the clock.

**Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Bill** [By Order.]—Order for Second Reading read and discharged, Bill withdrawn .. 460

Supply (Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates).

Postponed Proceeding on Motion made on consideration of Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including telegraphs."

Which Motion was, "That Item A be reduced by £100"—(*Mr. Annan Bryce*)—resumed.

Question again proposed, "That Item A be reduced by £100."

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon monday next .. 460

*May* 9.] Page

SUPPLY [8TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.—Revenue Departments.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs."

*The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 375
*Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury)* .. .. .. .. .. 388
*Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs)* .. .. .. .. .. 391

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A be reduced by £100."—*(Mr. Annan Bryce.)*

*Sir F. Banbury (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. 392
*Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 395
*Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs)* .. .. .. .. .. 397
*Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend)* .. .. .. .. .. 398
*Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton)* .. .. .. .. .. 400
*Mr. Crombie (Kincardineshire)* .. .. .. .. .. 402
*Mr. Wilkie (Dundee)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 403
*Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 405
*Mr. Staveley-Hill (Staffordshire, Kingswinford)* .. .. .. .. 406
*Mr. Morton (Sutherland)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 407
*Col. Lockwood (Essex, Epping)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 410
*Mr. MacLean (Bath)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 412
*Mr. Sydney Buxton* .. .. .. .. .. .. 413
*Mr. T. P. O'Connor (Liverpool, Scotland)* .. .. .. .. 419
*Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 421
*Mr. Fell (Gt. Yarmouth)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 422
*Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire)* .. .. .. .. .. 422
*Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 423
*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.)* .. .. .. .. 423
*Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 424
*Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 425
*Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs)* .. .. .. .. .. 426
*Mr. Sydney Buxton* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 427

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

*May* 9.] *Page*

**London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill** [By Order].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 429
*Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 432

Amendment proposed.—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question.'"

*Mr. Wood (Glasgow, St. Rollox)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 433
*Mr. W. F. D. Smith (Strand, Westminster)* .. .. .. .. 436
*Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. 439
*Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 441
*Mr. Bowerman (Deptford)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 442
*Mr. Waterlow (Islington, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 444
*Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich)* .. .. .. .. .. 446
*The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 450
*Mr. Crooks (Woolwich)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 453
*Mr. Dickinson (St. Pancras, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. 454
*Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 458

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next, at a quarter past Eight of the clock.

**Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Bill** [By Order.]—Order for Second Reading read and discharged, Bill withdrawn .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 460

Supply (Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates).

Postponed Proceeding on Motion made on consideration of Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including telegraphs."

Which Motion was, "That Item A be reduced by £100"—(*Mr. Annan Bryce*)—resumed.

Question again proposed, "That Item A be reduced by £100."

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon monday next .. .. .. 460

**Political Pensions Bill.**

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 :—

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday, 3rd June .. .. 460

Adjourned at six minutes after Eleven o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS : FRIDAY, 10TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.**—Read the third time, and passed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 461

### *PETITIONS.*

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Boyndie, for alteration ; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 461

FRENCH IMMIGRANTS (RELIGIOUS ORDERS.)—Petition from Inverary, for inquiry ; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 461

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Galashiels, in favour ; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 461

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petitions against : From Bungay ; Doncaster ; Folkestone ; Staines ; and, Sydenham ; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 461

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE.)—Petitions for legislation : From Barnstaple ; Barton-upon-Irwell ; Blackburn ; and, York ; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 461

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from Walsall, for prohibition ; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 461

### *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

TEINDS, ETC. (SCOTLAND).—Return [presented 9th May] to be printed. (No. 146.] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 462

May 10.] Page

CHARITY COMMISSIONERS (AGRICULTURAL LAND).—Return [presented 9th May] to be printed. [No. 148.] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 462

EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION.)—Copy presented, of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1905-6, Forty-second Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 149] .. .. .. .. .. .. 462

CLYDE PORTS (VESSELS ENTERING, ETC.).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th April; *Mr. Ainsworth*]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 462

ULTIMUS HÆRES (SCOTLAND) (ACCOUNT AND LIST OF ESTATES.)—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th May; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 147] .. .. .. .. .. 462

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

POSTAL SERVICE—RELATIVES IN THE SAME OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Duncan Schwann (Cheshire, Hyde); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. 462

SMITHFIELD POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 463

DEDUCTIONS FROM PROBATE GRANT TO COUNTY MAYO.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. 464

REVENUE RAISED FROM TAXES.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. ... .. .. .. .. .. 464

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—RE-INSTATEMENT OF HENRY SORAHAN.—Question, Mr. Thos. F. Smyth (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. 467

NAMES AND OCCUPATIONS OF IRISH DEPUTY-LIEUTENANTS.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 467

FORMER OCCUPATION OF IRISH RESIDENT MAGISTRATES.—Question, Mr. Vincent (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 467

RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS OF IRISH OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 467

SALE OF ESTATE OF MR. J. MARTIN OF BRYANSTOWN.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 468

RECEIVABLE ORDERS ISSUED TO MRS. ELLEN FARRELL OF CLONEVIT.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 469

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF THOS. KEENAN.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 469

ARMY PENSIONS—CASE OF THOS. MURPHY.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 469

ARMY PENSIONS—CASE OF JOHN TRACY.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 470

**Old-Age Pensions Bill.**—Order for Second Reading read.

*Mr. W. H. Lever (Cheshire, Wirral)* .. .. .. .. .. 470

*Sir F. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. 477

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be read a second time."—(*Mr. Lever.*)

*Mr. Harold Cox (Preston)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 483
*Sir F. Banbury (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 495

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that' and to insert the words 'this House declines to proceed further with a measure which would enormously add to the national expenditure until the country has had an opportunity of saying whether it is willing to bear the necessary burden of taxation.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*Mr. T. R. Bethell (Essex, Maldon)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 501
*Mr. J. W. Taylor (Durham, Chester-le-Street)* .. .. .. .. 503
*Mr. Duckworth (Stockport)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 505
*Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 507
*Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside)* .. .. .. 508
*Mr. Beale (Ayrshire, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 511
*Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford)* .. .. .. .. .. 513
*Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 516
*Mr. Crooks (Woolwich)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 517
*Mr. Verney (Bucks., N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 521
*The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea)* 523

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 232; Noes, 19. (Division List No. 165.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. William Lever.*)

**Advertisement Regulation Bill.**—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 4, after the word 'fund,' to insert the words 'in the case of the City of London out of the consolidated rate of that City."

"In Clause 6, to leave out sub-section (1), and to insert the words, '(1) Within the City of London, the mayor, aldermen and commons of that City, in common council assembled, and within the county of London outside the City of London the London County Council.' "—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Amendments agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time upon Friday, 14th June .. .. .. .. 531

TELEGRAPH [MONEY].—Committee to consider of authorising the issue, out of the Consolidated Fund, of sums for the purpose of the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1906 (King's Recommendation signified), upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 532

**Penrith Urban District Council Bill.**—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 532

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at sixteen minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 13TH MAY, 1907.

The Lord HOWARD DE WALDEN took the Oath.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Boston Spa Gas; Burnley Corporation; Shanklin Gas; Bristol Corporation; Brighouse Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. 533

**Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill** [H.L.].—Presented, and read 1ª .. 533

**Cavehill and Whitewell Tramways Bill** [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill: Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with .. .. .. 533

**Midland Railway Bill** [H.L.].—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments .. .. .. 533

**Coventry Corporation Water Bill** [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 533

**North British Railway Bill** [H.L.].—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments .. .. .. 533

**North East London Railway Bill.**—Read 2ª, and committed for To-morrow 533

**Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation Bill** [H.L.].—Committed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 533

*May* 13.] Page

**Great Northern and City Railway Bill.**—Brought from the Commons; read 1ª; and referred to the Examiners .. .. .. .. .. .. 533

**Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill** [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, etc.) Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order) .. .. .. .. .. 534

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.**—Brought from the Commons, and read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 54) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 534

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Code of regulations for continuation classes providing further instruction for those who have left school, 1907 .. .. .. 534

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3777. United States (Maryland), Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky).
No. 3778. Italy (Sicily).
No. 3779. France (Corsica).
No. 3780. France (Dunkirk).
No. 3781. Italy (Genoa) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 534

MINES AND QUARRIES (GENERAL REPORT AND STATISTICS FOR 1906) (PART I. DISTRICT STATISTICS).—Statistics of the persons employed, out-put, and accidents at mines and quarries in the United Kingdom, arranged according to the inspection districts .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 534

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom, during the three months ended 31st December, 1906; together with Reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the railway department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into. Part II. Reports on accidents .. .. .. .. 534

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—Return of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st March, 1907 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 534

INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1907–1908).—Explanatory memorandum by the Secretary of State for India .. .. .. .. .. .. 534

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).—Reports and tables relating to Irish migratory agricultural labourers, for the year 1906.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. 535

LUNACY.—Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the numbers of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the visitors of lunatics, pursuant to the Lunacy Act, 1890 from 1st October 1906, to 31st March, 1907 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 535

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST) CONSTANTINOPLE AND SMYRNA TO EGYPT AND BEYOND).—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 5) Warrant, 1907, dated 25th April, 1907 .. .. .. 535

*May* 13.]

Page

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (COUNTY OF LANCASTER).—Order made by the council of the County of Lancaster, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the Clayton-le-Moors, Oswaldtwistle, and Church Urban Districts .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 535

INDIA (FINANCE AND REVENUE ACCOUNTS).—Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India, for the year 1905–1906. 535

(Home Accounts)—Home Accounts of the Government of India.

(Progress and Condition)—Statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1905–1906. Forty-second Number.

(Estimate)—Estimate of revenue and expenditure of the Government of India for the year 1906–1907, compared with the results of 1905–1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 535

HOUSE OF LORDS REFORM.

*The Marquess of Lansdowne* .. .. .. .. .. .. 535
*The Lord Privy Seal* (*The Marquess of Ripon*) .. .. .. .. 536

SAILORS' NOTES.

*Lord Muskerry* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 537

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House His Majesty's Government should appoint a Committee to consider and report as to feasible schemes, either by means of proxy voting or otherwise, which would tend towards removing disabilities of mariners in recording their votes."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

*The Earl of Granard* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 541
*Lord Ellenborough* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 542
*The Marquess of Lansdowne* .. .. .. .. .. .. 544
*Lord Muskerry* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 545

On Question, Motion negatived.

SUGAR BEET INDUSTRY.

*The Earl of Denbigh* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 545
*Lord Denman* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 551
*Viscount Ridley* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 556
*The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) .. 559

**Destructive Insects and Pests Bill** [H.L.]—Bill read 3ª (according to order).

*Lord Balfour of Burleigh* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 560

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a schedule so much of the text of the Destructive Insects Act, 1877, as has not been repealed or varied by subsequent Acts of Parliament.—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

*The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries* (*Earl Carrington*) 562
*The Earl of Camperdown* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 563
*The Lord Chancellor* (*Lord Loreburn*) .. .. .. .. .. 563
*Earl Cawdor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 564

Moved, That the debate be adjourned.—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

*The Marquess of Ripon* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 564
*Lord Balfour of Burleigh* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 564

Motion for adjournment, by leave, withdrawn.

An Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

**Employment of Women Bill** [H.L.]—SECOND READING.—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*Earl Beauchamp* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 565

Moved, That the Bill be now read $2^{a}$.—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Bill read $2^{a}$, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS. MONDAY, 13TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders, not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords]; Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [Lords]; Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow .. .. 566

*May* 13.] Page

**Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill** [Lords]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment. .. 566

**Birmingham Corporation Bill** [Lords]; Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill; Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time .. .. .. .. .. .. 566

**Birmingham Corporation Water Bill** [Lords]; King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords]; Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [Lords]; Southend Water Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed .. .. 567

**London and North Western Railway Bill**.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. .. .. 567

Message from the Lords.—That they have agreed to:—Falmouth Gas Bill, without Amendment; Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the union of the Methodist New Connexion, the Bible Christians, and the United Methodist Free Churches under the name of 'The United Methodist Church,' to deal with real and personal property belonging to the said churches or denominations, to provide for the vesting of the said property in trust for the United Church so formed, land for the assimilation of the trusts thereof; and for other purposes." [United Methodist Church Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board to purchase certain waterworks from the Skelmersdale Urban District Council; and for other purposes." [Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to make provision with reference to claims by policy holders and other persons against other companies or persons for compensation or payment in respect of injuries." [Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation, Limited, Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the construction of further waterworks and the taking of water from the River Bure for the purpose of affording increased supplies of water by the Great Yarmouth Waterworks Company and the Lowestoft Water and Gas Company, to confer further powers upon those companies with reference to their respective undertakings; and for other purposes" [Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Selsey Water Company and to enable that Company to supply water in certain parishes in the county of Sussex." [Selsey Water Bill] [Lords] .. .. .. .. 567

**United Methodist Church Bill** [Lords]; Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [Lords]; Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [Lords]; Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]; Selsey Water Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. 568

May 13.]

Page

## PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS) BILL.—Petition from St. Marylebone, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 568

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.—Petition from St. Marylebone, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 568

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Argyll, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 568

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Tattingstone, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 568

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAYS (No. 2) BILL.—Petition from St. Marylebone, in favour to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 568

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from Rhuddlan, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 568

## RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1907–8).—Copy presented, of Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 569

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION WORKS).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th May; *Mr. Robert Price*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 150] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 569

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th May; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 151] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 569

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Return of the number of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 569

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND) (MIGRATORY LABOURERS).—Copy presented, of Report and Tables relating to Irish Migratory Agricultural and other Labourers for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 569

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Continuation Classes providing further instruction for those who have left school, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 569

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 5) Warrant, 1907, dated 25th April, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 569

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3780 and 3781 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 569

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—Copy presented, of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ended 31st December, 1906, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. 569

DAIRIES, COWSHEDS, AND MILKSHOPS (REGULATIONS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th February; *Dr. Rutherford*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 152] .. .. .. .. .. 570

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

MANUFACTURED GOODS IMPORTED FROM THE COLONIES.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. 570

CUSTODY OF THOMAS SLEVIN, NOW IN RAINHILL ASYLUM.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. 570

ARRESTS ON SUSPICION AT FINTOWN, COUNTY DONEGAL.—Question, Mr. Hugh Law (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Cherry .. .. .. .. .. 571

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—REINSTATEMENT OF TERENCE REILLY.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 572

HONORARY RANK ON RETIREMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERALS.—Question, Captain Faber (Hants, Andover); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. 572

MARRIED QUARTERS AT BULFORD CAMP.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 573

PREPARATION OF REPORTS OF THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE.—Questions, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 573

SITTINGS OF THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON THE MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Question, Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 574

SPEED OF H.M.S. "SCYLLA" AND "INDEFATIGABLE."—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. 575

NAVAL MANŒUVRES.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 575

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT AND THE POLICY OF THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS.—Questions, Mr. Markham; Answers, Mr. Trevelyan .. .. .. 575

CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES TARIFFS ON BRITISH GOODS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. 576

THE DISTURBANCES AT LAHORE.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. 577

RENEWAL OF LICENSING (IRELAND) ACT, 1902.—Question, Mr. Hugh Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 578

IRISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES FUND SURPLUS.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 578

*May* 13.] *Page*

SALE OF ESTATE OF LADY GRACE AT MONARD.—Question, Mr. Lundon (Limerick, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 579

THE MOUNTSHANNON ESTATE, COUNTY LIMERICK.—Question, Mr. Lundon, Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 579

EVICTED TENANTS IN COUNTY KILKENNY.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 580

THE PROPOSED IRISH COUNCIL—ANNUAL GRANT.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 581

CIVIL RIGHTS OF IRISH SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 581

MOONLIGHTING DISTURBANCES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 582

WOOLWICH INQUIRY COMMITTEE—GERMAN PROCEDURE.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 582

INSPECTION OF IRISH HARBOURS.—Question, Sir Thos. Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 583

PRESERVATION OF ANCIENT IRISH MONUMENTS.—Question, Sir Thos. Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 583

LOSS ON IRISH LAND PURCHASE—RELIEF OF BURDEN ON RATEPAYERS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. 586

WEST HAM WORKHOUSE INFIRMARY, AVERAGE WEEKLY COST AND COST OF ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS.—Question, Mr. C. Nicholson (Yorks., W.R., Doncaster); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. 586

POSTAL FACILITIES BETWEEN ENNISKILLEN AND TEMPO.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. 587

POSTAL FACILITIES AT BRACKLEY, COUNTY TYRONE.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. 588

TELEGRAPHIC OFFICE FOR GARRISON, COUNTY FERMANAGH.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. 588

CAVAN TRAIN SERVICES.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 589

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL—COST AND AMOUNT OF BUSINESS.—Question, Mr. Aldin (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. 590

THE PREROGATIVE OF MERCY.—Question, Mr. Akers Douglas (Kent, St. Augustine); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 590

NEW BUDGET PROPOSAL—POSTPONEMENT OF QUINQUENNIAL RE-VALUATION.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. 591

THE POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.—Questions, Mr. Walrond (Devonshire, Tiverton); Answers, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. 591

*May* 13.]

Page

DIFFERENTIATED INCOME TAX—RE-ARRANGEMENT OF SURVEYORS' STAFF.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. 593

RETIREMENT OF INDIAN POLICE OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 593

UNTENANTED LANDS IN THE MULLINGAR AND DELVIN DISTRICTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 594

VESTING OF IRISH COURT HOUSES IN THE COUNTY COUNCILS.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 594

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—PUBLICATION OF REPORT OF ESTATES COMMISSIONERS PRIOR TO INTRODUCTION OF BILL.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 594

APPLICATION OF GLENNAMADDY BOARD OF GUARDIANS FOR GRANT IN RELIEF OF DISTRESS.—Question, Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 595

PURCHASE OF THE ESTATE OF C. D. O'RORKE OF CLOONBIRREN.—Question, Mr. Hazleton; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 595

SURCHARGE ON MEMBERS OF CAVAN COUNTY COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 595

EVICTED TENANTS ON THE ESTATE OF CAPTAIN SINGLETON.—Question, Mr. T. W. Russell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 596

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—MEN INVALIDED THROUGH INJURIES RECEIVED ON DUTY.—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 596

DESTRUCTION OF IRISH TIMBER—SUGGESTED FORESTRY DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 597

IRISH CONSTABULARY FORCE FUND.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 597

APPLICATIONS FOR POSITIONS OF COUNTY SURVEYOR IN MEATH AND EAST GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 598

CHAIRMANSHIP OF IRISH PETTY SESSIONS COURTS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 598

DELAY IN REINSTATEMENT OF MR. JOHN O'BRIEN OF AUGHAMULDONEY.—Question, Mr. Dolan; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 599

PURCHASE OF ESTATE OF MRS. ACHERON AT DERWANA.—Question, Mr. Dolan; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 599

PURCHASE OF GRAZING LAND AT MEVOO, BALLYCORRY.—Question, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 599

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF J. FALEY OF LISTOWEL.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 600

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF WILLIAM HENNESSY OF LISTOWEL.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 600

*May* 13.] *Page*

SUMMARY JURISDICTION (IRELAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. 600

THE COLONIAL CONFERENCE AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. 601

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE AND MINING OPERATIONS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 601

THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. 601

RELIGION OF THE IRISH LAND COMMISSIONER.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 602

*QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

AUSTRALASIA AND THE NAVY.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.), Mr. J. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland) and Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 603

LYDDITE SHELL TENDERS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 603

NAVAL CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 604

LANCE-CORPORALS.—Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) .. .. .. 604

SOLDIERS WALKING OUT UNIFORM.—Questions, Mr. Ashley, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answers, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 605

SOLDIERS' KIT.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. 605

RIFLES FOR RIFLE CLUBS.—Questions, Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans), Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answers, Mr Haldane .. 606

ROYAL INNISKILLING FUSILIERS MILITIA STAFF.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 606

WOOLWICH ARSENAL AND EMIGRATION.—Questions, Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answers, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. 606

ENLISTMENT REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 607

TRANSVAAL VOLUNTEER FORCE.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 607

WOOLWICH LYDDITE SHELLS.—Questions, Mr. Bellairs; Answers, Mr. Haldane 608

ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane 609

CONDITIONS OF SERVICE IN THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 609

THE MILITIA.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 610

May 13.] Page

GUNNER CROSSAN, FIFE VOLUNTEER ARTILLERY. Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 610

ARTILLERY MILITIA—MOUNTED TRAINING.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 610

WORK FOR WOOLWICH ARSENAL.—Questions, Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Crooks; Answers, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 611

THE UNREST IN INDIA.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford), Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.), Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford), Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) and Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 612

NAIROBI INCIDENT.—Question, Mr. Carlile; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. .. .. 619

PANAMA CANAL WORKS.—Question, Mr. J. Ward; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 619

BRITISH INDIANS IN NATAL.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford and Mr. Rees (Montgomery Burghs); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. 619

BROOKETON COLLIERIES.—Questions, Sir E. SASSOON (Hythe); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 620

COLONIAL CONFERENCE REPORTS.—Questions, Mr. Hills (Durham), Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston) and Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 621

COLONIAL POLICY ON PREFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 622

BRITISH EAST AFRICA—THE SENOUSSI MOVEMENT.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 623

DISTRESS IN TRANSVAAL COLONY.—Questions, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby) and Sir Gilbert Parker; Answers, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. 623

UNLICENSED CHINESE COOLIES.—Questions, Mr. Mackarness (Berks, Newbury) and Mr. Herbert (Bucks, Wycombe); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. .. 624

JOHANNESBURG MINERS' STRIKE.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 624

ASSOUAN DAM—BRITISH LABOUR.—Question, Mr. J. Ward; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) .. .. 625

SHANGHAI STREET MURDER.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. Runciman 626

THE CONGO.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 627

IMPERIAL TRADE.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) .. .. .. .. .. 627

*May* 13.] Page

Colonial Conference.—Questions, Mr. Pike Pease, Mr. Arkwright (Hereford), Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.), Sir Gilbert Parker and Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answers, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. 628

The Finance Bill.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 630

Income Tax Refunds.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. 631

Income Tax on Divided Profits.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 631

Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills.—Question, Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. 631

Marine Biological Association.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. 632

Transvaal Loan.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 632

Vaccination and Education.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 632

Trawlers' Regulation Bill.—Questions, Mr. Morton and Dr. Rutherford; Answers, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 633

Juvenile Offenders.—Question, Sir E. Sassoon; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. .. .. 633

Expulsion of Aliens.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. 634

Street Betting Act—Effect on Race Meetings.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. 634

Edalji Case.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. 635

Dangerous Goods on Railways.—Question, Mr. Brunner (Lancashire, Leigh); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 635

Workmen's Fares on the District Railway.—Question, Mr. Chiozza Money; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 635

Duties on Government Stores landed in South Africa.—Question, Mr. Higham (Yorks., W.R., Sowerby); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. 636

Supply of Electricity Bill.—Question, Mr. Hay Morgan (Cornwall, Truro); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 637

Colonial Trade and Tariffs.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 637

Industrial Insurance.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 638

*May* 13.] *Page*

WOMEN ON LOCAL BODIES.—Question, Mr. Radford (Islington, E.); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 638

TUBERCULOSIS.—Question, Sir F. Channing; Answer, Mr. John Burns.. .. 639

HAMMERSMITH WORKHOUSE.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. John Burns.. 639

BRITISH MUSEUM CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. J. Ward; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale).. .. .. 640

CANADIAN LIVE CATTLE TRADE.—Questions, Sir F. Cawley (Lancashire, Prestwich) and Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answers, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) .. .. .. .. 640

WILTSHIRE SWINE FEVER ORDER.—Question, Mr. Rogers (Wiltshire, Devizes); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 641

SCOTTISH PAROCHIAL RELIEF CENSUS.—Question, Mr. Esslemont (Aberdeen, S.); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire).. .. 641

CLOSE TIME FOR LOBSTERS.—Question, Mr. J. Dewar (Inverness); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 642

SCOTTISH EDUCATION FINANCIAL REPORTS.—Question, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 642

IRISH COUNCIL BILL.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 643

TULLAMORE WHISKY FRAUDS.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 643

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 643

PUBLIC COMPANIES AND POLITICAL FUNDS—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

*Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping)* .. .. .. .. .. 644
*Mr. Clement Edwards (Denbigh Districts)* .. .. .. .. 645

**Limited Partnerships Bill.**—Reported, with an Amendment from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 153.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 153.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 192] .. .. .. 646

**Australian States Constitution Bill** [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 27th May, and to be printed. [Bill 193] .. 646

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—Frederick Leverton Harris, esquire, for the Parliamentary Borough of the Tower Hamlets (Stepney Division) .. .. .. 646

*May* 13.] *Page*

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND).

*The Lord-Advocate* (*Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs*) .. .. .. 646

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the ascertainment of land values in Scotland."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

*Mr. A. J. Balfour* (*City of London*) .. .. .. .. .. 649

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate, Mr. Sinclair, and Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland.

**Land Values (Scotland) Bill.**—"To provide for the ascertainment of Land Values in Scotland," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 27th May, and to be printed. [Bill 194.]

**Finance Bill.**—Order for second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. Austen Chamberlain* (*Worcestershire, E.*) .. .. .. .... 651

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'That,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the financial needs of the country, as disclosed in the Budget statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, require that the basis of taxation should be broadened, in order that the anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the present condition of national and Imperial trade.'"—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*The President of the Board of Education* (*Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 665
*Mr. Evelyn Cecil* (*Aston Manor*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 672
*Mr. Barnes* (*Glasgow, Blackfriars*) .. .. .. .. .. 677
*Mr. Bottomley* (*Hackney, S.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 683
*Mr. Lyttelton* (*St. George's, Hanover Square*) .. .. .. .. 690
*Mr. Lambton* (*Durham, S.E.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 695
*Sir Edward Sassoon* (*Hythe*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 699

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

**Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill** (BY ORDER).—As amended, considered.

*Mr. Ferens (Hull, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 701
*Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central)* .. .. .. .. .. 707

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 6, line 17, after the word 'contained,' to insert the words 'Provided also that no allowance shall be made for compulsory sale, but the arbitrator, arbitrators, or umpire, who shall determine such price or consideration (in this section called 'the court'), may make such allowance as they think just for recoupment of any loss of interest pending reinvestment, as well as for the cost of reinvestment, and for covering any costs, charges, and expenses (other than costs incurred in any arbitration under this Act), which have been, or are likely to be, incurred in consequence of the passing of this Act by the company or the stockholders therein, and which ought, in the opinion of the court, to be borne by the corporation.' "—(*Mr. Ferens.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

*Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University)* .. .. .. .. .. 709
*Mr. George Roberts (Norwich)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 709
*Mr. Corrie Grant (Warwickshire, Rugby)* .. .. .. .. 709
*Mr. Luke White (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose)* .. .. .. .. 710
*Sir Francis Powell (Wigan)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 710
*Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. 711
*Mr. C. Nicholson (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster)* .. .. .. 711
*Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 712
*The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 713

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 73; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 166.)

Bill to be read the third time.

**Finance Bill.**—Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the financial needs of the country, as disclosed in the Budget statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, require that the basis of taxation should be broadened in order that the anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the present condition of national and Imperial trade' "—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*)—instead thereof, resumed.

Question again proposed.

*Sir Edward Sassoon* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 717
*The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar)* .. 720
*Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley)* .. .. .. .. 728

Motion made, and Question, " That the debate be now adjourned "—(*Mr. Chiozza Money*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Eleven o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 14TH MAY, 1907.

The EARL of LIVERPOOL sat first in Parliament after the death of his father. .. 733

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with :—Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway ; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven.

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with.—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. .. 733

**Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill** [H.L.].—Committed .. 733

**Marriages Provisional Order Bill** ; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 733

**General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, Bill** [H.L.] ; Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill ; Harrison's Patent Bill [H.L.] ; Maidstone Gas Bill ; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [H.L.] ; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 733

**London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill** ; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill ; North East London Railway Bill.—Reported, without Amendment .. .. .. 733

**St. Neots Urban District Council Bill** [H.L.] ; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.] ; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons .. .. .. .. .. 733

**Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill** [H.L.] ; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to .. .. .. .. 734

*May* 14.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3782. United States (California, Nevada, and Utah, and the territory of Arizona) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 734

No. 3783. France (Calais).

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

I. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade authorising the construction of:—Light Railways in the borough of Mansfield and in the urban districts of Mansfield Woodhouse and of Sutton-in-the-Ashfield and in the rural district of Skegby, in the county of Nottingham, in extension of the Light Railways authorised by the Mansfield and District Light Railways Order, 1901, and for other purposes; A Light Railway in the West Riding of the County of York, from Sharow to Kirkby Malzeard; Light Railways in the urban district of Llanelly and in the rural district of Llanelly, in the county of Carmarthen; Light Railways in the West Riding of the county of York, from Ackworth to Kirk Smeaton.

II. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade amending:—The Dudley and District Light Railways Order, 1898, and the Dudley and District Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1900; The Brackenhill Light Railway Orders of 1901 and 1904; The Leicester and District Light Railways Order, 1904; The Robertsbridge and Pevensey Light Railway Orders of 1900 and 1903 .. .. .. 734

MINES AND QUARRIES (EXPLOSION AT URPETH COLLIERY).—Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by J. B. Atkinson, M.Sc., one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, on the circumstances attending an explosion which occurred at Urpeth Colliery, near Birtley, Durham, on 17th December, 1906 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 734

RAILWAY RETURNS (PRELIMINARY STATEMENT).—Return relating to the railways of the United Kingdom for the year 1906. Preliminary Statement.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. 735

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).—Order made by the Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire altering certain polling districts in the Sowerby, Barnsley, Doncaster, and Holmfirth Parliamentary Divisions.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 735

**Factory and Workshops Bill** [H.L.] [SECOND READING].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*Earl Beauchamp* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 735

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

*The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury* .. .. .. .. .. 739

*The Earl of Lytton* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 744

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday the 4th June next.

**Companies Bill** [H.L.]—Report of Amendments received.

Clause 11 :—

*The Earl of Granard* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 749

Amendment moved—

" In Clause 11, page 10, line 24, to leave out from the word ' company,' to the word ' provided ' in line 26, and to insert the words, ' in like manner as the register of mortgages under section forty-three of the Companies Act, 1862, and the provisions of that section (including the penal provisions thereof) shall apply accordingly.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 17 :—

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 749

Amendment moved—

" In Clause 17, page 12, line 9, after the word ' issued,' to insert the the words ' or re-issued under this section.' "—(*Lord Avebury*).

*The Earl of Granard* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 749

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 750

Amendment moved—

" In Clause 17, page 12, line 13, after the word ' do,' to insert the words ' contained in such debentures or in any trust deeds securing the same.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*The Earl of Granard* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 750

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

" In Clause 17, page 12, line 13, after the word ' do,' to insert the words ' and not being an obligation enforceable only by the person to whom the redeemed debentures were issued.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 750

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 22, to leave out from the word 'issued' to the end of Sub-section (1)."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 751

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 31, after the word 'have" to insert the words 'whether before or after the passing of this Act.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 751

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 35, to leave out the words 'a current account,' and to insert the words 'an advance.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*The Lord Chancellor* (*Lord Loreburn*) .. .. .. .. .. 752

On Question, Amendment agreed to

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 752

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 37, after the word 'credit,' to insert the words, 'or cease to be in debit, nor shall other holders of debentures of the same series or class or any subsequent encumbrances be entitled to treat payments into such account as in reduction of the amount for which the debentures in security may rank as against such other holders or subsequent encumbrances.' "—(*Lord Avebury*)

*The Earl of Granard* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 753
*Lord Alverstone* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 753
*The Lord Chancellor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 753

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 753

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, after Sub-section (3) to insert the following new sub-section :—(4) 'The foregoing provisions shall *mutatis mutandis* apply and be deemed to have applied not only to debentures or debenture stock, issued as completed securities, but also to debentures or certificates for debenture stock deposited or issued in blank with or without power to fill up the blanks, and to provisional certificates for debentures or debenture stock.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

May 14.] Page

*The Lord Chancellor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. ... 754
*Lord Alverstone* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 754

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 17, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided that nothing in this section shall prejudice the operation of any judgment or order of a court of competent jurisdiction pronounced or made before the seventh day of March, one thousand nine hundred and seven, as between the parties to the proceedings in which the judgment was pronounced or the order made, and any appeal from any such judgment or order shall be decided as if this Act had not been passed.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "In Clause 17, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided also that nothing herein contained shall derogate from or prejudice any power to issue debentures in the place of any debentures paid off or otherwise satisfied or extinguished reserved to a company by its debentures or the securities of the same.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 21.

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 755

Amendment proposed—

> "In Clause 21, page 14, line 23, after the word 'days,' to insert the words 'before the annual general meeting,' and leave out the word 'by,' and after the word 'company,' to insert the words 'shall, at the expense of the nominator, send such notice,' and after the word 'shareholder' to insert the words 'and to the retiring auditors.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*The Earl of Granard* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 756
*Lord Alverstone* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 756
*Lord Faber* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 756
*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 756

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 757

Amendment proposed—

> "In Clause 21, page 14, line 32, after the word 'pounds' to insert as a new sub-section:—'(6) Where in any prospectus issued by a company any person is named as the auditor, the said person shall, unless he resign the appointment, continue to be the auditor of the said company until the first annual general meeting succeeding the issue thereof.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 41:—

*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 757

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 41, page 20, lines 40 and 41, to leave out the words 'independently of the presence or votes of any shareholders of any other class.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*The Earl of Granard* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 757

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed—

"After Clause 46, to insert as a new clause: 'An extraordinary resolution for the purposes of the Companies Act, 1862, and this Act, means a resolution which is passed in such manner as would, if it had been confirmed by a subsequent meeting, have constituted a special resolution, and section fifty-three of the Companies Act, 1862, shall apply in the case of an extraordinary resolution in like manner as that section applies in the case of a special resolution, with the substitution of a reference to the date of the passing of the extraordinary resolution for the reference to the date of the confirmation of the special resolution.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 50:—

*Lord Balfour of Burleigh* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 758
*The Lord Chancellor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 759
*Lord Balfour of Burleigh* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 760
*The Chairman of the Committees* (*The Earl of Onslow*) .. .. 760
*The Lord Privy Seal* (*The Marquess of Ripon*) .. .. .. .. 761
*The Lord Chancellor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 761
*The Marquess of Lansdowne* .. .. .. .. .. . 762

Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next, and to be printed as amended. (No. 55.)

THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

*The Earl of Wemyss* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 762

**Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill** [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee .. .. .. .. .. .. 763

**Prize Courts Bill** [H.L.]; EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN BILL [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order): Bills reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.. .. 763

**Municipal Representation Bill** [H.L.].

Moved, That the following Lords be named of the Select Committee—

E. Hardwicke.
E. Cathcart.
E. Beauchamp.
L. Colchester.
L. Monteagle of Brandon.
L. Belper.
L. Ampthill.
L. Avebury.
L. Haversham.
L. Pirrie.
L. Courtney of Penwith.
L. Allendale.

—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*The Marquess of Lansdowne* .. .. .. .. .. .. 763
*Lord Avebury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 764

On Question, Motion, as amended, agreed to, and the Lords following were named of the Select Committee—

E. Hardwicke.
E. Cathcart.
E. Beauchamp.
L. Colchester.
L. Monteagle of Brandon.
L. Belper.
L. Ampthill.
L. Avebury.
L. Haversham.
L. Courtney of Penwith.
L. Allendale.

The Committee to meet on Thursday next, at half-past Three o'clock and to appoint their own Chairman.

**Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill** [H.L.]—A Bill to amend the law relating to the capacity of women to be elected and act as members of county or borough councils—was presented by The Lord President (*E. Crewe*); read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday, the 30th instant. (No. 56.) .. .. .. .. .. 764

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 14TH MAY, 1907

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Great Central Railway Bill.**—As amended, considered, a Clause added, Amendments made, Bill to be read the third time .. .. .. .. 764

**Tyne Improvement Bill** [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Read a second time, and committed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 765

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill**; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Read a second time and committed .. 765

**Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited, Order Confirmation Bill.**—"To confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited," presented by Mr. Sinclair, and ordered, under Section 7 of the Act, to be considered upon Thursday .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 765

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Evesham, Melton Mowbray, the Dewsbury Joint Hospital District, and the Mid Sussex Joint Water District," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 195] .. .. .. 765

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the borough of East Ham and urban districts of Barking Town and Ilford, and the borough of Sunderland," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 196] .. .. .. .. 765

**Newquay and District Water Bill** [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. .. 765

**London United Tramways Bill.**—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. 765

**Baines' Name Bill** [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 766

**Borax Consolidated Bill** [LORDS].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 766

**Tees Conservancy Bill** [LORDS].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. .. .. .. 766

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the Destructive Insects Act, 1877, to all pests destructive to crops, trees, or bushes." [Destructive Insects and Pests Bill [Lords].

*May* 14.] *Page*

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of St. Neot's to acquire the undertaking of the St. Neot's Water Company, and to supply water throughout their district and the neighbourhood thereof; and for other purposes." [St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for the granting of superannuation allowances to the officers and servants of the Council of the royal borough of Kensington; and for other purposes." [Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill intituled, "An Act to authorise the Corporation of Tynemouth to construct additional works; to borrow additional moneys; and for other purposes." [Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [Lords]. .. 766

**St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill** [Lords]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 766

### *PETITIONS.*

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Petition from Aspatria, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 767

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill.—Petition from Fulham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 767

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions for alteration: From Aberdour; Dumfries; and Wick and Pulteneytown; to lie upon the Table .. .. 767

Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill.—Petition from Blackwell, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 767

Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill.—Petition from Fulham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 767

Housing of the Working Classes, Etc., Bill.—Petition from Falkirk, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 767

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: From Assynt; Candleriggs; and, Kirkintilloch; to lie upon the Table .. .. 767

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petitions against: From Barry; and, Bishop's Fonthill; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 767

Pauper Lunatics (Cost of Maintenance).—Petitions for legislation: From Farnham; Faversham; Lewisham; Longtown; and, Romford; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 767

### *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

Clyde Ports (Vessels Entering, Etc.).—Return [Presented 10th May] to be printed. [No. 154] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 767

Railway Returns (Preliminary Statement).—Copy presented, of Return relating to the Railways of the United Kingdom for the year 1906 (Preliminary Statement) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 768

*May* 14.]

Page

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Robertsbridge and Pevensey Light Railway Orders of 1900 and 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 768

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Mansfield and in the urban districts of Mansfield Woodhouse and of Sutton-in-Ashfield and in the rural district of Skegby, in the county of Nottingham, in extension of the Light Railways authorised by the Mansfield and District Light Railways Order, 1901,and for other purposes [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 768

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Leicester and District Light Railways Order, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 768

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Brackenhill Light Railway Orders of 1901 and of 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 768

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the West Riding of the county of York, from Ackworth to Kirk Smeaton [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 768

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the urban district of Llanelly and in the rural district of Llanelly, in the county of Carmarthen [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 769

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Dudley and District Light Railways Order, 1898, and the Dudley and District Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 769

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the West Riding of the county of York, from Sharow to Kirkby Malzeard [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 769

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3782 and 3783 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 769

MINES AND QUARRIES (EXPLOSION AT URPETH COLLIERY.)—Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by J. B. Atkinson, Esquire, M.Sc., one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, on the circumstances attending an Explosion which occurred at Urpeth Colliery, near Birtley, Durham, on 17th December, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 769

*May* 14.] Page

POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire altering certain Polling Districts in the Sowerby, Barnsley, Doncaster, and Holmfirth Parliamentary Divisions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. 769

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.—Return ordered: "showing: (1) the Rates of Duties, Taxes, or Imports collected by Imperial officers; (2) the quantities or amounts taxed; (3) the gross receipts derived from each Duty; and (4) the net receipts and appropriations thereof in the year ending the 31st day of March, 1907; and (1) the aggregate gross receipts derived from all such Duties, Taxes, or Imposts under the principal heads of revenue; (2) the aggregate net receipts; (3) the charges of collection; and (4) the produce, after deducting these charges, in each of the ten years ending the 31st day of March, 1907; and notes to show any changes in the Taxes, Duties, and Imposts consequent upon the acceptance of the Budget proposals of 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 253, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Goddard*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 770

CROFTERS HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.—Copy ordered "of the Crofters Holdings Scotland) Acts, indicating the extensions and Amendments thereof proposed by the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill."—(*Mr. Sinclair*) .. .. .. 770

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

DUMBARTON SEWAGE PURIFICATION —Question, Mr. Robert Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answer, Mr Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. 770

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF THOMAS WALSH —Question, Mr Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 771

LAND PURCHASE FINANCE—OPPORTUNITY FOR DISCUSSION.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. 771

LETTING OF CROWN PROPERTY—EMPLOYMENT OF LOCAL AGENTS.—Question, Sir George Kekewich (Exeter); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. 771

SALE OF SPIRIT LICENCES IN AMRITSAR.—Question, Mr. Herbert Roberts (Derbyshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. 772

IRISH SAVINGS BANK BUSINESS.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 772

IRISH POSTAL BUSINESS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. 773

SUGGESTED TRANSFER OF IRISH POSTAL SAVINGS BANK BUSINESS TO DUBLIN. —Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. 775

LOSS OF REGISTERED LETTERS ADDRESSED TO SPAIN.—Question, Mr. Henniker Heaton (Canterbury); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. 775

OVERTIME OF DUBLIN TELEGRAPHISTS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 775

METROPOLITAN RAILWAY WHISTLES.—Question, Mr. Stanger (Kensington, W.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 776

*May* 14.] *Page*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTORS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 776

RESTRICTION OF OCEAN-FISHING RIGHTS OFF COUNTY DONEGAL.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 777

IRISH STONE FOR IRISH GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 777

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF FRANCIS GALLAGHER.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 778

WHEREABOUTS OF BURROWES, OF BURROWES AND MAYNE.—Question, Mr. Cogan (Wicklow, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 778

THE IRISH PRIVY COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 778

THE DUNRAVEN DEVOLUTION SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 779

THE IRISH COUNCIL—REVENUE OF THE EIGHT DEPARTMENTS TO BE ABSORBED.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 779

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF BRYAN GALVIN.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 779

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF MICHAEL MULVIHILL.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 780

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF MRS. CONNOR.—Question, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 780

FREE GRANTS TO CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PIERS, HARBOURS, ETC.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 780

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

GREENWICH OBSERVATORY AND THE COUNTY COUNCIL GENERATING STATION.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. .. .. .. 781

SALE OF OBSOLETE WAR VESSELS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. 781

DOCKYARD WRITERS.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth), and Mr. Mallet (Plymouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. 782

ROYAL SCOTS GREYS.—Question, Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) .. .. .. 783

VOLUNTEER FIELD ARTILLERY.—Question, Captain Faber (Hants, Andover), and Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. 783

UNREST IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. .. .. .. 784

*May* 14.] *Page*

THE ZAMBESI FALLS.—Questions, Mr. Essex (Gloucestershire, Cirencester), Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) and Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 784

THE NEW HEBRIDES.—Questions, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrew's Burghs) Sir Gilbert Parker, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley), and Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. 785

ST. HELENA.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 786

BRITISH EMBASSY AT TOKIO—MEDICAL OFFICERS.—Questions, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.), and Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answers, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 787

SWEDEN AND NORWAY—TREATY NEGOTIATIONS.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 788

TONKIN RAILWAYS.—Question, Sir F. Cawley (Lancashire, Prestwich); Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 788

EGYPTIAN MINISTRY OF JUSTICE.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. 788

BRITISH CONSULS IN EGYPT.—Questions, Mr. J. M. Robertson and Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central); Answers, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. 789

CAIRO POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 790

ALIEN CRIMINALS.—Question, Captain Faber (Hants, Andover); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. 790

HOURS OF WORK IN MINES INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. 790

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS COMPANY AND THE LONDON MUNICIPAL SOCIETY.—Question, Mr. Wiles (Islington, S.); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) .. .. .. .. 791

REGISTRAR OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 792

WEST RIDING HIGHER EDUCATION RATE.—Question, Mr. Clough (Yorks., W.R., Skipton); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. 793

HONG KONG MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Holt (Northumberland, Hexham); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 793

PUNISHMENT IN THE POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. O'Grady; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 795

May 14.]

Page

EDUCATION OF BOARDED-OUT PAUPER CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 795

HALSALL CHARITY.—Question, Sir G. Kekewich (Exeter); Answer, Mr. McKenna 796

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Clough; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. 796

DEFAULTING EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Clough; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 797

SCHOOL RETURN FOR WALES.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 797

BOY CLERKS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.—Question, Sir George Kekewich; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) .. 798

CUSTOMS SERVICE.—Question, Mr. J. M. Roberston; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 798

HOUSE-LETTING IN SCOTLAND.—Questions, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan) and Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answers, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) .. .. .. .. .. .. 799

INVERNESS-SHIRE SANATORIUM.—Question, Mr. J. Dewar (Inverness); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 799

GRAZING FARMS IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. .. .. .. 799

SCOTLAND AND THE IRISH COUNCIL GRANT.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) .. .. .. .. .. 800

NEW SOUTH WALES AND UNIMPROVED LAND VALUES.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 800

STANDING COMMITTEES.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) and Mr. T. W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 801

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 801

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).—Mr. STUART-WORTLEY reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had appointed Sir William Holland to act as Chairman of Standing Committee A, in the place of Sir Thomas Esmonde; and Sir David Brynmor Jones to act as Chairman of Standing Committee B, in the place of Mr. J. W. Wilson.

Report to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 802

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Notification of Births Bill); Mr. Secretary Gladstone and Mr. Herbert Samuel; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Notification of Births Bill): Mr. Burns and Dr. Macnamara.

May 14.]

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee A the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Notification of Births Bill) :—Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Verney, Mr. Gulland, Mr. Masterman, Mr. Sherwell, Mr. Tennant, Dr. Cooper, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. Holt, Mr. Duncan Schwann, Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, Mr. James Gibb, Mr. Charles MacVeigh, and Mr. Percy Barlow.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee B (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill) : Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Burns; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill) : Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland and Sir Edward Strachey.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee B the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill) :—Viscount Morpeth, Mr. Hicks-Beach, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Hugh Barrie, Lord Willoughby d'Eresby, Mr. Lundon, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Halpin, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Nuttall, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Winfrey, Major M'Micking, Mr. Arthur Henderson, and Mr. A. H. Scott.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill) : Mr. Burns and Dr. Macnamara; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill : Mr. Secretary Gladstone and Dr. Macnamara.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee B the following fourteen Members (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill) : Mr. Cave, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Maclean, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. Arthur Dewar, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Hall, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Thomas F. Smyth, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Charles Corbett, Mr. Clough, and Major Dunne.

Reports to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 802

## *NEW BILLS.*

**Diseases of Animals Act (1896) Amendment Bill**—"To amend the Diseases of Animals Act, 1896, with regard to the importation of Canadian live cattle," presented by Mr. Cairns; supported by Mr. Hamar Greenwood, Mr. Robert Price, Mr. Baker, Mr. Halley Stewart, Mr. Maddison, Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Sir Frederick Cawley, Mr. Cross, and Mr. Crooks; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 4th June, and to be printed. [Bill 197] .. .. .. .. .. 804

**mported Watch-Cases Bill.**—"To exempt from assay foreign watch-cases imported into the United Kingdom before the first day of July, nineteen hundred and seven," presented by Mr. Kearley; to be read a second time upon Monday, 27th May, and to be printed. [Bill 198] .. 804

**Conveyancing Bill.**—"To amend the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881," presented by Mr. Micklem; supported by Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Radford, Mr. Berridge, Mr. Cave, Sir Francis Lowe, Mr. Astbury, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Bertram, and Mr. Napier; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th May, and to be printed. [Bill 199] .. .. .. .. 804

**Settled Land Bill.**—"To amend the Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890," presented by Mr. Micklem; supported by Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Radford, Mr. Berridge, Mr. Cave, Sir Francis Lowe, Mr. Astbury, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Bertram, and Mr. Napier; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th May, and to be printed. [Bill 200] .. .. .. .. .. .. 804

**Married Women's Property Bill.**—"To amend the Married Women's Property Act, 1882," presented by Mr. Micklem; supported by Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Radford, Mr. Berridge, Mr. Cave, Sir Francis Lowe, Mr. Astbury, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Bertram, and Mr. Napier; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th May, and to be printed. [Bill 201] .. .. .. 804

**Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill.**—"To facilitate the admission in Evidence of Statutes passed by the Legislatures of British Possessions and Protectorates, including Cyprus," presented by Mr. Churchill; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 202] .. .. .. .. .. 805

**Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill.**—"To confirm a scheme approved and certified by the Board of Education under the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853, relating to the Hulme Trust Estates (Educational)," presented by Mr. McKenna; supported by Mr. Lough, Mr. Bright, Sir Charles Schwann, Mr. Talbot, and Mr. Toulmin; to be read a second time upon Friday, 24th May, and to be printed. [Bill 203] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 805

**Finance Bill.**—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [13th May] "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the financial needs of the country, as disclosed in the Budget statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, require that the basis of taxation should be broadened, in order that the anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the present condition of national and imperial trade' "—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*) —instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*Mr. Chiozza-Money (Paddington, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. 805
*Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash)* .. .. .. .. 818
*Mr. J. Ramsey Macdonald (Leicester)* .. .. .. .. .. 822
*Mr. Mallet (Plymouth)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 830
*Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 834
*The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.)* .. 847
*Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry)* .. .. .. .. .. 856
*Mr. Mond (Chester)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 859
*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lancashire, N.W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 865
*Mr. Rendall (Gloucestershire, Thornbury)* .. .. .. .. .. 869
*Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 871
*Mr. Toulmin (Bury, Lancashire)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 876

*Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 886
*Mr. Harwood (Bolton)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 888
*Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich)* .. .. .. .. .. 893
*The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury)* .. 906

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 376 ; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 167.)

Main Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 304 ; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 168.)

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.

**Public Health Bill.**—Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 919

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS [STAMP DUTY].—Committee to consider of authorising the imposition of an ad valorem Stamp Duty on contributions by limited partners in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to establish Limited Partnerships (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 920

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at four minutes before Twelve o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 15TH MAY, 1907.

The VISCOUNT GOSCHEN sat first in Parliament after the death of his father 921

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Worthing Gas Bill.**—Read $2^a$, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection .. .. .. .. .. .. 921

**Burnley Corporation Bill**; Shanklin Gas Bill; Bristol Corporation Bill; Brighouse Corporation Bill; Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [H.L.].—Read $2^a$, and committed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 921

**Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill** [H.L.].—Read $3^a$; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 921

ALTON MILITARY HOSPITAL.—Moved, that the order made on the 20th March last "That this House will not receive any petition for a Private Bill later than Thursday, the 2nd day of May next," be dispensed with, and that leave be given to the right hon. Sir William Purdie Treloar, Knight, Lord Mayor of the City of London, to present a petition praying for leave to introduce a Bill "to enable the Alton Military Hospital to be utilised for the purposes of a cripples' college," agreed to. Petition, together with a copy of the proposed Bill annexed thereto, read, and referred to the Examiners .. 921

PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS—Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92 and 93 be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, also the time for depositing Documents relating to any Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess

**Marriages Provisional Order Bill**; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—House in Committee (according to order); Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read $3^{a}$ To-morrow .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 921

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

COMPENSATION FOR INDUSTRIAL DISEASES.—Report of the Departmental Committee on Compensation for Industrial Diseases; Report, minutes of evidence and appendices .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 922

TRADE REPORTS, ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3784. United States (Hawaii).
No. 3785. Greece (Trade, etc., of Piræus and district).
No. 3786. Greece (Corfu, Cephalonia, and Zante).
No. 3787. Roumania .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 922

FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).—Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1906. Part I. General Report.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. 922

**Employment of Women Bill** [H.L.]; Prize Courts Bill [H.L.].—Read $3^{a}$ (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons .. .. .. .. 922

NATURALISATION.

*Earl Russell* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 922
*The Lord Chancellor (Lord Loreburn)* .. .. .. .. .. 924

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

*Lord James of Hereford* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 925
*The Lord President of the Council (The Earl of Crewe)* .. .. .. 925
*The Earl of Halsbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 925

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 15TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill**; Leeds Corporation Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill. Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time .. .. 926

Private Bills, etc.—Ordered, That Standing Orders 39, 128, and 230 be suspended, and that the time for depositing Petitions and Memorials against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, and for depositing duplicates of any Documents relating to any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, also for depositing at the Private Bill Office all Documents relating to any Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*). .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 926

Message from the Lords.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to regulate and facilitate the increase of the capital of the Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited; and for other purposes." [Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [Lords].

**Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill** [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. .. .. .. 926

### *PETITIONS.*

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.—Petition from Wombwell Main, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 926

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Langholm, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 927

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petitions against: From Bristol; Edgbaston; Enfield; Prestbury; and, Wortham; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 927

Municipal Milk Depots Bill.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 927

Pauper Lunatics (Cost of Maintenance).—Petition from Wem, for legislation; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 927

Public Libraries Bill.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 927

Weekly Rest Day Bill.—Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 927

*May* 15.] *Page*

## RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1906. Part I., General Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. 927

COMPENSATION FOR INDUSTRIAL DISEASES.—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee on Compensation for Industrial Diseases. Report, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 927

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3784 to 3790 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 927

SINKING FUNDS.—Account presented, of the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt, showing the amount received and applied in the year ended 31st March, 1907, in respect of the Old and New Sinking Funds [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 155] .. .. .. 927

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Temporary Laws, Register of Temporary Laws for the Second Session, Twenty-eighth Parliament, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, pursuant to the Report of the Select Committee on Expiring Laws in session 1866; to be printed. [No. 156] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 928

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.—Address for " Return of the Memorandum of the Royal College of Physicians in May, 1905, on Plague."—(*Dr. Rutherford*) 928

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

INDIAN DISTURBANCES—LAND REVENUE SYSTEM.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. 928

INDIAN BUDGET—ISSUE OF EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM.—Question, Mr. Annan Bryce (Inverness Burghs); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. 929

PROGRESS OF INDIA—DATE OF PUBLICATION OF BLUE BOOK.—Question, Mr. Annan Bryce; Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. 929

OPENING UP OF TRADE ROUTE FROM NORTH-EAST ASSAM TO SZE-CHUAN.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. 930

CREWS OF H.M.S. " MARS " AND " HANNIBAL."—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. 930

CHATHAM AND SHEERNESS TORPEDO BOAT FLOTILLA.—Question, Mr. Nield; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. 930

PROMOTION OF TELEGRAPHISTS AT EDINBURGH.—Question, Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. 930

HOURS OF LABOUR AT DEPTFORD DOCKYARD.—Questions, Mr. Bowerman (Deptford); Answers, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. 931

*May* 15.] Page

SANITARY CONDITION OF POST OFFICES IN THE CITY OF LONDON.—Question, Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. 932

IRISH SOLICITORS' LICENCE DUTY.—Questions, Mr. O'Doherty (Donegal, N.), Mr. Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answers, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. 932

IRISH COUNCIL BILL—INCOME OF THE EIGHT DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. 933

SALMON FISHERIES IN SCOTLAND—PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FISHING RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. 933

WHISKY FRAUDS IN IRELAND—ARREST OF THE SECRETARY OF D. E. WILLIAMS, LIMITED.—Question, Mr. Haviland Burke (King's County, Tullamore); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 934

MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 935

IRISH QUIT RENTS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. 935

ROSCREA DISTRICT COUNCIL LOAN.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 936

ARMAGH DISTRICT COUNCIL—DELAY IN SANCTION.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 936

NEW IRISH COUNCIL—COST OF GENERAL ELECTION.—Question, Sir F. Banbury (City of London); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 937

IRISH COUNCIL—INCOMES OF DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. George Clark (Belfast, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 937

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF MR. TIMOTHY O'CALLAGHAN.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 938

TELEPHONE FROM TRALEE POLICE BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 939

IRISH COUNCIL—ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION AND SANCTION OF THE LORD LIEUTENANT.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 939

CESSION OF PART OF SWAZILAND TO THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. 939

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OF IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 940

CIVIL SERVICE HIGHER APPOINTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 940

APPOINTMENTS IN THE SURVEYING DEPARTMENT OF THE POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. 940

SURPLUSES SURRENDERED FROM IRISH VOTES.—Question, Mr. Field; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 941

Page

INCREASE ON CUSTOMS ESTIMATE DUE TO INCREASE OF SALARIES.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. 941

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—UNCLAIMED BALANCES.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. 942

METROPOLITAN WATER BOARD AND THE TREATMENT OF THE STAFF.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. 942

PAYMENT OF VACCINATION OFFICERS.—Question, Sir William Bull (Hammersmith); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. 943

CONSTRUCTION OF WORKHOUSES AND INFIRMARIES.—Question, Sir William Bull; Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 943

CHARGES FOR CERTIFICATES OF BIRTH.—Question, Mr. W. Johnson (Warwickshire, Nuneaton); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. 944

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD MESSENGERS.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. 945

MIDLAND RAILWAY—RUNNING ENGINES TENDER FIRST.—Question, Sir F. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. 945

DISCIPLINE OF CUSTOMS OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 945

IRISH LAND STOCK.—Question, Mr. Walker (Leicestershire, Melton); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 946

PAYMENT OF INDIAN OFFICERS ON LEAVE IN ENGLAND.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. 946

SUPPORT OF MICHAEL NOLAN, AN EX-ARMY MAN.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Lim erick, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 947

MINIMUM STAFF AT WOOLWICH.—Question, Viscount Helmsley (Yorks, N.R., Thirsk); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 947

PAY AND POSITION OF CIVIL ENGINEERS, ARCHITECTS, ETC., ON ARMY STAFF.—Question, Mr. Godfrey Baring (Isle of Wight); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 947

PAY OF SPECIAL RESERVISTS.—Question, Viscount Morpeth (Birmingham, S.); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 948

*QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

ALTON MILITARY HOSPITAL.—Question, Mr. W. Nicholson (Hants, Petersfield); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden) .. .. .. .. 948

PLAGUE IN INDIA.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middesex, Brentford); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. .. 949

UNREST IN INDIA.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford and Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answers, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 949

*May* 15.] *Page*

COTTON GROWING IN BRITISH EAST AFRICA.—Questions, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 950

SWAZILAND.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 952

TRANSVAAL GOVERNMENT AND COOLIE LABOUR.—Questions, Captain Craig (Down, E.), and Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 952

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Lehmann (Leicestershire, Market Harborough); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. 953

NEW TRANSVAAL LOAN.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorks., W.R., Barkston Ash); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 954

GENERAL BOTHA AND THE CHINESE COOLIES.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 954

MOROCCO.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) .. .. .. 954

MR. ABBOT'S RANSOM.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 955

LABOUR ON THE PANAMA CANAL.—Questions, Mr. John Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) and Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 955

COST OF THE CONSULAR SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 956

CONSULS.—Question, Mr. Straus (Tower Hamlets, Mile End); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 957

CIVIL SERVANTS' PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 957

INCOME TAX.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. 957

LONDON POLICE AND PUBLIC MEETINGS.—Questions, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central), Mr. J. Ward, and Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 958

LAWLESSNESS IN LONDON.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 959

INSPECTION OF LAUNDRIES.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 959

VIVISECTION LICENSES.—Question, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 960

WOMEN WEAVERS AND THEIR DINNER HOUR.—Question, Mr. Bowles; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 960

CAHIRCIVEEN PIER.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 960

*May.* 15.]

Page

SHIPPING DUES.—Question, Mr. J. Ward; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. 961

POOR RELIEF COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Brooke (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 961

EDUCATION CODE.—Question, Sir Francis Powell (Wigan); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) .. 962

SECONDARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Sir Francis Powell; Answer, Mr. McKenna.. 962

BOARD OF EDUCATION—MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyne); Answer. Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. 963

OFFICE OF WORKS STAFF.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale) .. .. 963

ROYAL BOTANIC GARDENS, KEW—WAGES OF EMPLOYEES.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 963

STOKERS AT KEW GARDENS.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 964

SCOTTISH JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas. Shaw, Hawick Burghs) .. .. 964

SALMON FISHERIES IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr Sinclair, Forfarshire) .. .. .. .. 965

NEW IRISH COUNCIL.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. .. .. .. .. 965

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS—RELIGIOUS PRESSURE.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. 965

REENARD PIER.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. 966

BELFAST MAIL CAR CONTRACT.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answer, Mr. Birrell 966

MR. TIMOTHY O'RORKE, J.P.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale; Answers, Mr. Birrell .. 966

ELPHIN DEMONSTRATION.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 967

NEWMARKET-ON-FERGUS OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 967

RINNEEN OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 968

STEAM TRAWLING IN BALLINSKELLIGS BAY.—Questions, Mr. Boland and Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 968

KILMORE DEMONSTRATION.—Question, Sir Berkeley Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 969

ATHENRY OUTRAGE.—Question, Viscount Turnour; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 970

*May* 15.] *Page*

LOUGHREA GRAZING FARM OUTRAGES.—Question, Viscount Turnour; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 970

CLOONISKERT GRAZING FARM OUTRAGE.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answers, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 971

TOWN TENANTS LEAGUE, ATHENRY.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 971

BALLINMORE BRIDGE OUTRAGE.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig and Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answers, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 972

IRISH MOTOR COMMUNICATION SCHEME.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 973

GRAZING FARM DISPUTES.—Questions, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. Moore, and Mr. John O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answers, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 973

IRISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE FINANCE.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 974

POLICE PROTECTION IN COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 974

BALLYMONEY LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME.—Questions, Mr. Glendinning (Antrim, N.), Mr. Moore and Captain Craig; Answers, Mr. Birrell .. .. 975

MORLEY ESTATE, COUNTY CAVAN.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 976

THE IRISH TREASURY.—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 976

IRISH EQUIVALENT GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Patrick White; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 976

IRISH DEPARTMENTS—CONSTITUTION.—Question, Mr. Patrick White; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 977

IRISH DEPARTMENTS—LORD-LIEUTENANT'S AND CHIEF SECRETARY'S POWERS OF APPOINTMENT OR DISMISSAL.—Question, Mr. Patrick White; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 977

POLICE PROTECTION ON GRAZING FARMS.—Questions, Mr. Arkwright (Hereford), and Viscount Turnour; Answers, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 977

LOCAL TAXATION (IRELAND) ACCOUNT.—Question, Mr. Patrick White; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 978

IRISH LOTTERIES.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) .. .. 979

THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE CONDITION OF IRELAND.—Questions, Captain Craig, Mr. Mooney (Newry), Viscount Turnour, and Mr. T. L. Corbett; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 979

UNEMPLOYED FUNDS.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 980

UNREST IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. 980

BLOCKING MOTIONS.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs), and Mr. Moore; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. 981

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Samuel Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid); Answer, Sir H Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. 982

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Dr. Macnamara; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Report to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 982

EDUCATION (POPULAR CONTROL).

*Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil)* .. .. .. .. .. 983

Motion made, and Question, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the law relating to the management of public elementary schools not provided by the local education authority"—(*Mr. D. A. Thomas*)—put, and agreed to

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. David Alfred Thomas, Mr. Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Brace, Mr. David Davies, Mr. Samuel Evans, Colonel Herbert, Sir David Brynmor Jones, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Wynford Philipps, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Osmond Williams.

**Education (Popular Control) Bill.**—"To amend the law relating to the management of public elementary schools not provided by the local education authority," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th May, and to be printed. [Bill 204.]

THE WHITSUNTIDE RECESS.

Motion made, "That the House at its rising on May 16th, do adjourn until Thursday, May 23rd."—*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*

*Sir John Kennaway (Devonshire, Honiton)* .. .. .. .. 984
*Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean)* .. .. .. 986
*Earl Percy (Kensington, S.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 991
*Mr. Bennett (Oxfordshire, Woodstock)* .. .. .. .. .. 994
*Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 998
*Sir F. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.)* .. .. .. .. 999
*Mr. Nolan (Louth, S.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1001
*Mr. George White (Norfolk, N.W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 1005
*Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs)* .. .. .. .. .. 1009
*The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1011
*Mr. Walsh (Lancashire, Ince)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1017

*May* 16.}

Page
*Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury)* .. .. .. .. .. 1019
*The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1021
*Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square)* .. .. .. .. 1024
*Mr. Pirie (Aberdeen, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1026
*Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1027
*Mr. Austen Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth)* .. .. .. .. 1030
*The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs)* .. .. .. .. .. 1031
*Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley)* .. .. .. .. .. 1035

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, "That this House at its rising To-morrow do adjourn until Thursday, the 23rd May."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

HIGHER EDUCATION.

*Mr. Silcock (Somersetshire, Wells)* .. .. .. .. .. 1037
*Mr. Adkins (Lancashire, Middleton)* .. .. .. .. .. 1039
*Sir Philip Magnus (London University)* .. .. .. .. .. 1046
*Mr. Shackleton (Lancashire, Clitheroe)* .. .. .. .. .. 1050
*The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1052
*Sir William Anson (Oxford University)* .. .. .. .. .. 1056
*Mr. Yoxall (Nottingham, W.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1061
*Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University)* .. .. .. .. .. 1064
*Mr. Stuart (Sunderland)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1066

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

**Limited Partnerships Bill.**—Order for consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

*Mr. Speaker* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1068

Bill recommitted to the former Committee in respect of Clause II.

Adjourned at eight minutes after Eleven o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 16TH MAY, 1907.

The LORD BRODRICK (*V. Midleton*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1069

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders [H.L.].

*May* 16.] *Page*

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill : Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.. .. .. .. .. 1069

**Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill** [H.L.].—Petition for additional provision ; of the Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Council, under their Common Seal, together with the proposed clause and Amendments annexed thereto ; read, and referred to the Examiners.. .. 1069

**Ashton-under Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill** [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments .. 1069

**Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill** ; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill ; Boston Spa Gas Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed .. 1069

**North East London Railway Bill** ; London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill ; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill.—Read 3ª, and passed .. .. .. .. .. 1069

**Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill** ; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1069

**Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill** [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1069

**Marriages Provisional Order Bill** ; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—Read 3ª (according to order), and passed .. .. .. .. 1069

### *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

Colonial Conference, 1907.—Published Proceedings and Précis of the Colonial Conference, 30th April to 14th May 1907 .. .. .. .. 1070

Trade Reports (Annual Series).

No. 3788. Siam (Monthons of Saiburi and Puket).

No. 3789. Argentine Republic (Buenos Ayres).

No. 3790. Portugal (Beira) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1070

Edalji.—Papers relating to the case of George Edalji .. .. .. .. 1070

Mines (Eight Hour Day for Miners).—Final Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inquire into the probable economic effect of a limit of eight hours to the working day of coal miners ; Report, minutes of evidence, and appendices.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. 1070

Polling Districts.

(County of Durham). Order made by the council of the county of Durham altering certain polling districts in the South-eastern and Houghton-le-Spring Parliamentary Divisions.

May 16.] *Page*

(County of Lancaster). Order made by the council of the county of Lancaster re-dividing the Darwen Parliamentary Division into convenient polling districts .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1070

Shop Hours Act, 1904 (Borough of Accrington).—Orders made by the council of the borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the borough .. .. .. .. .. .. 1070

Naval Savings Banks.—Account of deposits in Naval Savings Banks and the payments thereof, and of interest thereon, of all investments under the Naval Savings Banks Act, 1866, and the application of the interest or dividends accruing in respect thereof, and of the proceeds of any sale of any stocks, annuities, or securities during the financial year 1905–1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1070

**Companies Bill** [H.L.].—Bill read 3ª (according to order).

*The Lord Chancellor* (*Lord Loreburn*) .. .. .. .. .. 1071

Amendment moved—

"In page 12, line 34, after Subsection (3), to insert as a new subsection—(4) The re-issue of a debenture or the issue of another debenture in its place under this section, whether made before or after the passing of this Act, shall be treated as the issue of a new debenture for the purposes of stamp duty, but it shall not be so treated for the purpose of any provision limiting the amount or number of debentures to be issued.' "—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*The Lord Chancellor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1071

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 49 to insert as a new clause: 'The Amendments specified in the Third Schedule to this Act, which relate to minor details, shall be made in the Companies Act.' "—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"Clause 50, page 22, line 25, to leave out the word 'Third' and to insert the word 'Fourth.'—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*The Lord Chancellor* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1072

*May* 16.] *Page*

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, at end, to insert as a new schedule—

THIRD SCHEDULE

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS OF COMPANIES ACTS.

| Enactment to be amended. | Nature of Amendment. |
|---|---|
| Companies Act, 1862 (25 & 26 Vict. c. 89), s. 28. | After the word "stock" there shall be inserted the words "or re-converted stock into shares."<br>After the word "conversion" there shall be inserted the words "or re-conversion."<br>After the word "converted" there shall be inserted the words "or the stock re-converted." |
| s. 32 - - - | After the words "herein-before mentioned" there shall be inserted the words "or any part thereof."<br>After the word "sixpence" there shall be inserted the words "or such less sum as the company may prescribe."<br>After the words "hundred words" there shall be inserted the words "or fractional part thereof." |
| s. 143 - - | At the beginning there shall be inserted the words "Within one week after such meeting."<br>After the words "the same was held" there shall be inserted the words "The registrar on receiving such return shall forthwith register it." |
| Companies Act, 1867 (30 & 31 Vict. c. 131), s. 16. | After the word "paid" there shall be inserted the words "or (as the case may be) the reduced amount, if any, which is to be deemed to have been paid." |
| Companies Act, 1879 (42 & 43 Vict. c. 76), s. 5. | For the words "in cases where no such increase of nominal capital may be resolved upon" there shall be substituted the words "either in conjunction with or without any such increase of nominal capital." |
| s. 7 - - - | The whole section except the proviso to sub-section (5) to be repealed. |

(*The Lord Chancellor*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed and sent to the Commons.

THE UNION JACK CLUB.

*Lord Rosmead* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1073
*Earl Beauchamp* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1074

**Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies Bill** [H.L.]; Dental companies (Restrictions of Practice) Bill [H.L.]. —The Lords following were named of the Select Committee :—V. Falkland, V. Knutsford, L. Hylton, L. Ludlow, L. Colebrook.

The Committee appoint their own Chairman .. .. .. .. .. 1075

House adjourned at Twenty minutes before Five o'clock, to Tuesday, the 28th instant, half-past Ten o'clock.

Page

## HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY, 16TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a Quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill.**—Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1075

**Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill** (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed .. .. .. 1075

**Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill** [LORDS].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments .. .. .. .. .. 1075

**Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill.**—Read the third time, and passed .. 1075

**West Yorkshire Tramways Bill** [LORDS].—To be read a third time upon Thursday next .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1075

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Norwich, and the counties of London and Middlesex," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 205] .. .. .. 1075

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Crediton, Portsmouth, and the Waltham Joint Hospital District," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 206] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1075

**Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5 Bill).**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Minehead and Dunster, Rhymney Valley (Gelligaer, Mynyddislwyn, and Bedwellty), and St. Albans and District," presented by Mr. Lloyd-George; supported by Mr. Kearley; read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 207] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1076

**Armagh Urban District Council Bill.**—Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments. Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1076

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill; North East London Railway Bill; London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to repeal Section 57 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and part of Section 7 of The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, relating to the employment of women and children," [Employment of Women Bill [Lords],

*May* 16.] *Page*

Also, a Bill intituled, "An Act for amending the Law relating to the administration of oaths for the purpose of proceedings in Prize Courts." [Prize Courts Bill [Lords].]

And, also, a Bill intituled, "An Act to amend the Companies Acts, 1862 to 1900." [Companies Bill [Lords].] .. .. .. .. .. 1076

## *PETITIONS.*

ADVERTISEMENTS' REGULATION BILL.—Petition from St. Marylebone, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1076

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions, for alteration: From Arbroath and Forfar; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1076

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petitions against: From Ardwick; Kennington Park; Pimlico; Winchester; and Worthing; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

MUNICIPAL MILK DEPÔTS BILL.—Petition from St. Marylebone against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petitions for legislation: From Long Ashton; and Plymouth; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 1077

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

SALE OF WHISKEY BILL.—Petition from St. Marylebone, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

TRUST INVESTMENT BILL.—Petition of the Law Society of the United Kingdom, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

CASE OF GEORGE EDALJI.—Copy presented, of Papers relating to the case of George Edalji [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.. .. .. .. 1077

MINES (EIGHT HOUR DAY FOR MINERS).—Copy presented, of Final Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to enquire into the probable economic effect of a limit of Eight Hours to the working day of Coal Miners, together with Report, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

INSPECTORS OF MINES.—Return Presented, relative thereto [Address 27th March; *Mr. Summerbell*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 157] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF LANCASTER).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Lancaster, redividing the Darwen Parliamentary Division into convenient Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

*May* 16.] Page

Polling Districts (County of Durham).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Durham, altering certain Polling Districts in the South-Eastern and Houghton-le-Spring Parliamentary Divisions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1077

Shop Hours Act, 1904.—Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 1078

Colonial Conference, 1907.—Copy presented, of Published Proceedings and Précis of the Colonial Conference, 30th April to 14th May, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. ..1078

Naval Savings Banks.—Account presented, of Deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payments thereof, and the interest thereon, etc., during the financial year 1905–6 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 158] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1078

Government Departments Securities.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 10th April; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 159] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1078

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.—Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Tithe Acts, Copyhold Act, 1894, Inclosure Acts, and other Acts for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1078

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3791 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1078

Rents and Royalties arising from Mines under the Sea.—Return ordered, "showing (1) the companies or persons in the county of Cumberland holding leases from the Crown to mine under the sea; (2) the dates of such leases being made; (3) the rate of Rent or Royalty paid under each lease; and (4) the amount annually accruing to the Crown under each lease."—(*Mr. George Roberts*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1078

Steamship Subsidies.—Return ordered, "of all sums payable out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom in the year 1906–7 in respect of Steamship Subsidies, showing: (*a*) the total amount of the Subsidies; (*b*) the payments out of the Exchequer; and (*c*) the dates at which the contracts providing for the Subsidies begin and end, the services stipulated to be performed, and the revenue, if any, collected in connection with these services and either paid into the Exchequer or treated as an Appropriation-in-Aid."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1079

*QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

Suggested Remission of Sentence on Stoker Moody.—Question, Mr. Swift MacNeill (Donegal, S.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. 1079

English Government Departments Exercising Powers in Ireland.—Question, Mr. George Clark (Belfast, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 1079

Distribution of Untenanted Land on the Mount Shannon Estate.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 1080

*May* 16.] *Page*

REPATRIATION OF CHINESE COOLIES.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. 1080

ALLOCATION OF THE TRANSVAAL LOAN.—Question, Sir F. Banbury (City of London); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. 1080

NAVAL PENSIONS—CASE OF GEORGE DAY.—Question, Mr. W. Benn (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. 1083

PAY AND DUTIES OF ADMIRALTY WRITING STAFF.—Question, Mr. E. H. Lamb (Rochester); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. 1083

RELATIONS IN POSTAL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Duncan Schwann (Cheshire, Hyde); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton.. .. .. .. .. .. 1084

POSTAGE ON POST CARDS FROM CYPRUS TO UNITED KINGDOM.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. 1085

SEIZURE OF AMMUNITION AT NEWCASTLE.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham S.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1085

ACCOMMODATION AT COPLEY SCHOOL, HALIFAX.—Question, Mr. Carlile (Herts, St. Albans); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. .. .. 1085

INCOME TAX ON AUTHORS' ROYALTIES.—Question, Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1086

IRISH COUNCIL BILL—POWERS OF THE EIGHT DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E,); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 1087

POWERS OF THE IRISH PRIVY COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1087

IRISH COUNCIL BILL AND IRISH BOARDS.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh: Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1087

NEW IRISH COUNCIL—POWER OF LORD-LIEUTENANT.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 1088

ACTION OF MR. CROZIER, J.P., OF BLACKLION.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1088

IRISH COUNCIL REPRESENTATION.—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1089

NEW ARMY SCHEME—FINANCIAL LIABILITY OF COUNTY ASSOCIATIONS.—Question, Colonel Long (Worcestershire, Evesham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1089

INDUCEMENT TO MILITIAMEN TO JOIN SPECIAL CONTINGENT.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. 1089

VOLUNTEERS—SPECIAL CONTINGENT.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1089

TRAINED VOLUNTEERS AND THE NEW TERRITORIAL ARMY.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. 1090

*May* 16.] *Page*

Barracks without Accommodation for Royal Army Temperance Association.—Question, Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1090

Fortieth Brigade Royal Field Artillery—Compensation for Expenses Incurred under Orders now Cancelled.—Question, Mr. Harris (Tower Hamlets, Stepney); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 1091

Labourers' Pay at Woolwich Arsenal.—Question, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1091

Cavalry Barracks for Scotland.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 1091

Extension of Scottish Small Landholders Bill to England.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. 1091

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

Manufacture of Torpedoes.—Questions, Mr. Scarisbrick (Dorsetshire, S.), Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1092

Training Youths at Sea.—Question, Mr. Beauchamp (Suffolk, Lowestoft); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. 1092

Empire Day.—Questions, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answers, Mr. J. A. Pease (Essex, Saffron Walden), for Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 1092

War Department Land at Hilsea.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1093

Sandhurst Cadets—Delay in Gazetting.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease .. .. .. .. .. 1094

Army Pay.—Question, Captain Faber (Hants, Andover); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1094

The Yeomanry.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. J. A. Pease .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1094

New Territorial Force Estimates.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington) Answer, Mr J. A. Pease .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1095

Indian Land Tax.—Questions, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth), Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. Chas. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) .. .. .. .. 1095

Arrest of a Basuto Chief.—Question, Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1096

The Imperial Conference.—Questions, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.), Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham), Mr. Pike Pease; Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 1097

Japanese Bounties in Korea.—Question, Sir F. Cawley (Lancashire, Prestwich); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1098

*May* 16.] *Page*

TRURO-HELSTON DIVISION—LAND TAX COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Mr. Hay Morgan (Cornwall, Truro); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1099

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD—ASSISTANT CLERKS' PENSION.—Questions, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1099

CAMBERWELL INFIRMARY.—Questions, Mr. Rees, Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1100

LOCAL TAXATION GRANT-IN-AID.—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1101

EDUCATION GRANTS.—Question, Mr. Patrick White; Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) .. .. 1101

MEDICAL INSPECTION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. KcKenna .. .. .. .. .. 1102

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT MEDICAL OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. .. .. 1102

SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REPORTS.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) .. 1102

SCOTTISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPORTS.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1103

SCOTTISH SLAUGHTER HOUSES.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1103

INSPECTION OF CARCASES OF SWINE.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1103

DISEASED MEAT IN GLASGOW MARKET.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1104

UNITED IRISH LEAGUE AND THE ESTATES COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool Exchange) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1104

INCENDIARY FIRES IN KING'S COUNTY.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Cherry .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1105

EXPORTS OF IRISH CATTLE.—Question, Captain Craig; Answers, Mr. Cherry 1106

DUNDRUM BRIDGE SCHEME.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Cherry .. 1106

GOVERNMENT RURAL ASSESSMENT.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Cherry .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1107

BELFAST DOCK LABOURERS' STRIKE.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Mr. Cherry .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1108

KELLET'S ESTATE, MEATH.—Question, Mr. Patrick White; Answer, Mr. Cherry 1109

*May* 16.] *Page*

IRISH GRAZING FARM DISPUTES.—Question, Captain Craig, Viscount Turnour; Answer, Mr. Cherry .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1109

KILMORE DEMONSTRATION.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Cherry .. 1110

ATHENRY DEMONSTRATION.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Cherry .. 1110

GOVERNMENT LAND LEGISLATION.—Question, Mr. Maclean (Bath); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1111

RETURNING OFFICERS FEES.—Question, Viscount Turnour; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1111

DR. SMARTT.—Question, Mr. H. Pearson (Suffolk, Eye); Answer, Mr. Speaker.. 1111

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES). Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee B (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Sir Howard Vincent.

Report to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1112

**Post Office Sites Bill**. Mr. Buxton, Mr. George Greenwood, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham), nominated Members of the Select Committee on the Post Office Sites Bill.—(*Mr. Whiteley*) .. .. .. .. .. 1112

**Companies Bill** [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 24th May, and to be printed. [Bill 208] .. .. .. .. 1112

SUPPLY [9TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS I.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £348,700, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Rates and Contributions in lieu of Rates, etc., in respect of Government Property, and for Rates on Houses occupied by Representatives of Foreign Powers, and for the Salaries and Expenses of the Rating of Government Property Department, and for a Contribution towards the Expenses of the London Fire Brigade."

*Mr. Morton* (*Sutherland*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1113

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £348,600, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Page

*Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis)* .. 1114
*Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire)* .. 1114
*Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs)* .. 1114
*The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury)* .. 1115
*Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby)* .. 1115
*Sir F. Banbury (City of London)* .. 1116
*Mr. Crooks (Woolwich)* .. 1116

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.
*Mr. Morton* .. 1116

Question put, and agreed to.

### Class II.

2. £39,400 to complete the sum for Exchequer and Audit Department.

*Mr. Morton* .. 1116

Vote agreed to.

3. £41 to complete the sum for the Mint, including Coinage.

*Sir F. Banbury* .. 1117
*Mr. Runciman* .. 1117
*Mr. Morton* .. 1118
*Mr. Leif Jones* .. 1118
*Mr. Runciman* .. 1119

Vote agreed to.

4. £8,153 to complete the sum for National Debt Office.

*Sir F. Banbury* .. 1119
*Mr. Runciman* .. 1120

Vote agreed to.

### Revenue Departments.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £608,700, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the salaries and expenses of the Customs Department."

*Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend)* .. 1120

Motion made and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £608,600 be granted for the said Service."—*(Sir Gilbert Parker.)*

*Mr. Runciman* .. 1122
*Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton)* .. 1123
*Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College)* .. 1123

*Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby)* .. .. .. 1124
*Mr. Morton* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1125
*Mr. Runciman* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1125
*Sir Gilbert Parker* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1126
*Mr. Maddison (Burnley)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1127
*Sir F. Banbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1128
*Mr. William Rutherford* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1128
*Mr. Lief Jones* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1130
*Mr. Morton* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1130

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 11 ; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 169.)

*Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 1131
*Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside)* .. .. .. .. 1133
*Sir F. Banbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1134
*Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1135
*Mr. Stewart (Greenock)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1135
*Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham)* .. .. .. .. .. 1136
*Mr. William Rutherford* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1137
*Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1138
*Mr. Runciman* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1139
*Lord Balcarres* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1141

Vote agreed to.

6. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £1,469,300, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the salaries and expenses of the Inland Revenue Department."

*Sir F. Banbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1142

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,449,300, be granted for the said Service."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

*Mr. Morton* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1143

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 10 ; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 170.)

Original Question again proposed.

*Mr. Claude Hay* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1143

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,469,200, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 7 ; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 171.)

Original Question again proposed.

*Mr. Claude Hay* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1145
*Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1146
*Mr. Runciman* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1147

Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS VI.

7. £373,400, to complete the sum for Superannuation and Retired Allowances.

8. £368, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £139, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Hospitals and Infirmaries, and certain Miscellaneous, Charitable, and other Allowances in Ireland, including sundry Grants in Aid."

*Captain Craig (Down, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1148

Notice taken that forty Members were not present; Committee counted, and forty Members not being present,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

House counted, and forty Members not being present, the House was adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Seven of the clock.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Seven o'clock till Thursday, 23rd May.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 23RD MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]; United Methodist Church Bill [Lords]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time .. .. .. .. 1149

*May* 23.] *Page*

Provisional Order Bills (no Standing Orders applicable).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow .. .. 1149

Provisional Order Bills (Standing Orders applicable thereto Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow .. .. 1149

**Baines' Name Bill** [Lords.]—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1150

**Birmingham Corporation Bill** [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1150

**Borax Consolidated Bill** [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1150

**Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill**; Leeds Corporation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1150

**London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill** (King's Consent signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed .. .. .. 1150

**Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill** [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments .. .. .. .. .. 1150

**King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill**; London and North Western Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Newquay and District Water Bill [Lords]; Penrith Urban District Council Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time .. .. .. 1150

**Kendal Corporation Bill** [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed .. .. .. .. 1150

**Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill** [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1150

**West Yorkshire Tramways Bill** [Lords] (by Order).—Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1150

**Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited, Order Compensation Bill**—Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next .. .. .. 1150

May 23.] Page

## PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: From Blantyre; and, Inverurie; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.—Petition from Halifax, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

PAROCHIAL MEDICAL OFFICERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Dundee against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from South Shields, for legislation; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

## PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The following Papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Whitsuntide Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3792 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

EMIGRATION.—Copy of Memorandum on the History and Functions of the Emigrants' Information Office .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy of Thirty-fourth Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scottish Education Department .. .. .. 1151

ALIENS ACT, 1905.—Copy of Return of Alien Passengers brought to the United Kingdom from Ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ending 31st March, 1907, together with the number of Expulsion Orders made during that period requiring Aliens to leave the United Kingdom .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1151

CONGESTION IN IRELAND (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy of Fourth Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the operation of the Acts dealing with Congestion in Ireland (Minutes of Evidence, taken in London, 14th to 23rd February, 1907, and Documents relating thereto) .. 1152

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy of List of Public Elementary Schools and Certified Efficient Schools in England (excluding Monmouthshire) on 1st August, 1906.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1152

## RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3793 to 3799 [by Command] to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1152

*May* 23.] Page

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series. No. 660 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1152

TREATY SERIES (No. 13, 1907).—Copy presented of Treaty between the United Kingdom and Peru for the Mutual Surrender of Fugitive Criminals. Signed at Lima, 26th January, 1904. (Ratifications exchanged at Lima, 30th November, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1152

WEST INDIAN SUGAR TRADE.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st May; *Sir Edward Sassoon*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 160] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1152

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.—Copy presented, of Memorandum by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries upon the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1152

FEE FUND (HOUSE OF LORDS).—Account presented, of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords from 1st April, 1906 to 31st March 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1153

ARMY.—Copy presented, of Statement showing the proposed Financial Control over the Expenditure connected with the Territorial Force [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1153

LUNACY (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Forty-ninth Annual Report of the General Board of Commissioners in Lunacy for Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1153

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Report of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, with Appendix, 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1153

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION ACTS, 1881 AND 1892.—Copy presented, of Forty-third Annual Report on Alkali, etc., Works by the Chief Inspector, being for 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 161] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1153

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Medway Conservancy. Copy of Statement of Receipts and Expenditure of the Conservators for the year ending 25th March, 1907 [by Act] .. .. .. 1153

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

STABLING FOR SCOTS GREYS AT TIDWORTH.—Question Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Haldane, .. .. .. .. .. .. 1153

REMOVAL OF SCOTS GREYS FROM EDINBURGH.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 1154

CANADIAN TARIFF.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1154

MUNICIPAL MILK DEPOTS.—Question, Mr. Ridsdale (Brighton); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1154

*May* 23.] *Page*

CONVEYANCE OF CATTLE—"The Iverna."—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey .. .. .. .. .. .. 1157

ADMIRALTY COMMITTEE ON ENGINEER BRANCH OF ROYAL NAVY—PUBLICATION OF MAJORITY AND MINORITY REPORTS.—Question, Mr. Bonar Law (Camberwell, Dulwich); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. 1158

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

DEPUTY LIEUTENANTS AND THE TERRITORIAL FORCES.—Question, Sir F. Banbury (City of London); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1159

DISBANDED INFANTRY BATTALIONS—SUPERNUMERARY MAJORS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. 1159

CAVALRY FOR SCOTLAND.—Question, Colonel Harrison-Broadley (Yorkshire, E.R., Howdenshire); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 1159

PIERSHILL BARRACKS.—Question, Colonel Harrison-Broadley; Answer Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1160

BOMBAY POLICE.—Question, Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. .. .. 1160

WEST AFRICAN SHIPPING TRADE.—Questions, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1161

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE—ALL-BRITISH MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1162

REPORT ON THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.—Question, Colonel Harrison-Broadley; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1162

OPIUM FOR CHINESE COOLIES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Colonel Harrison-Broadley and Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. 1162

BOARD OF TRADE RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1163

GERMAN MUSLIN IMPORTS.—Question, Colonel Harrison-Broadley; Answer, Mr. Kearley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1163

SECONDARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Colonel Harrison-Broadley; Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) .. 1164

UNITED STATES AND GERMANY.—Question, Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1164

BRITISH SHIPPING CLAIMS AGAINST RUSSIA.—Question, Sir J. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth); Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. 1165

*May* 23.] *Page*

Banagher Grazing Farm Dispute.—Question, Mr. Carlile (Herts, St. Albans); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1165

Allotments and Small Holdings.—Question, Sir J. Randles; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1166

Irish Council Bill.—Question, Sir F. Banbury; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1166

A Question of Procedure.—Question, Mr. Forster (Kent, Sevenoaks); Answer, Mr. Speaker .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1166

Selection (Standing Committees).—Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill), Mr. Harwood, and had appointed in substitution, Mr. Duckworth (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill).

Report to lie upon the Table.

Supply [10th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Civil Services and Revenue Departments Estimates, 1907–8.

Class II.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £77,840, be granted to His Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, and of Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, including certain Grants in Aid."

*Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1168

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries and Wages) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

*Mr. Rogers (Wiltshire, Devizes)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1175
*Sir F. Banbury (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1176
*Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1177
*Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey)* .. .. .. .. .. 1178
*Mr. Bowerman (Deptford)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1181
*Mr. Jackson (Greenwich)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1182
*Mr. Partington (Derbyshire, High Peak)* .. .. .. .. .. 1183
*Sir F. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. 1184
*Mr. Everett (Suffolk, Woodbridge)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1186
*Mr. E. Gardner (Berkshire, Wokingham)* .. .. .. .. .. 1186
*Mr. Beck (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech)* .. .. .. .. .. 1188
*The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.)* .. 1189
*Mr. Courthope* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1202

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the reduced sum of £77,740 be granted for the said service."—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

*Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans)* .. .. .. .. .. 1203
*Dr. Cooper* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1203

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question again proposed.

*Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1205

Motion made and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £77,340, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Summerbell.*)

*Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford)* .. .. .. .. .. 1205
*Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1206
*Mr. C. Duncan (Barrow-in-Furness)* .. .. .. .. .. 1206
*Sir Edward Strachey* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1206
*Mr. Summerbell* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1208
*Mr. C. Duncan* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1209
*Mr. Carlile* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1209
*Mr. McCullum (Paisley)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1211

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 21 ; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 172.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

### Class III.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £407,605, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the expenses of the prisons in England, Wales, and the Colonies."

*Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 1212

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £407,505, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*)

*Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1216
*Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield)* .. .. .. .. 1217
*The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.)* 1218
*Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1223
*Mr. Byles (Salford, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1225

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

3. £127,105, to complete the sum for Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain.
4. £24,128, to complete the sum for Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum.

Resolutions [16th May] and Resolutions of this day to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

SUPPLY [2ND MAY].

Resolutions reported.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS III.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £36,985, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioner of Police, the Police Courts, and the Metropolitan Police Establishment of Dublin."

CLASS II.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £24,568, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £46,411, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland"

Resolutions agreed to .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1228

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to .. .. .. .. .. .. 1228

Adjourned accordingly at half after Eight o'Clock.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 24TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill** [LORDS] (BY ORDER).—Read a second time, and committed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1229

*May* 24.] *Page*

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill**; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill: Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1229

**Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2.)**—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Dublin, Portrush, and Fermoy, presented by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1229

**Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3).**—Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the rural districts of Rathdown (No. 1), Monaghan, Balrothery, and Belfast, presented by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland .. .. .. 1229

**Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill and Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.**—Ordered, That, in the case of the Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill and of the Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill, Standing Order 193A be suspended, and the Bills be read the first time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means*) .. .. .. .. .. 1229

**Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Dublin, Portrush, and Fermoy," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 209] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1229

**Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.**—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the rural districts of Rathdown (No. 1), Monaghan, Balrothery, and Belfast," read the first time; referred tothe Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 210] .. .. .. .. .. 1229

### *PETITIONS.*

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: From Ferry Port-on-Craig; Latheron; and, Rathven; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1230

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.—Petition of the county council of the West Riding of Yorkshire, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. 1230

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL.—Petition from Ayr, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1230

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Fearn; and, London; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. 1230

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Chale, against; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1230

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from Colchester, for legislation; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1230

PROBATION OF OFFENDERS (No. 2) BILL.—Petition from Ayr, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1230

*May* 24.] *Page*

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Ayr, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1230

ULLAPOOL FREE CHURCH.—Petition from Ullapool, for further inquiry; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1230

WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.—Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1230

## RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND BRITISH POSSESSIONS).—Copy presented, of annual statement of the trade of the United Kingdom with foreign countries and British Possessions for 1906. Volume II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1230

ENDOWED CHARITIES (ELEMENTARY EDUCATION) (CORNWALL).—Copy presented, of Report made to the Board of Education in the result of an inquiry into endowments subject to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894, and appropriated in whole or in part to purposes of elementary education in the county of Cornwall or in any part thereof [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1231

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.—Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under The Irish Land Act, 1903, during the months of July and October, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1231

CROFTERS HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered, 14th May; *Mr. Sinclair*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 162] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1231

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.—Copy presented, of Returns relating to the Council up to 31st March, 1907, with Estimate of Expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 163] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1231

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3,800 to 3,803 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1231

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

TAXIMETER CABS.—Question, Mr. Goddard Clarke (Camberwell, Peckham); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1232

COCOA DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1232

HARTLEY WINTNEY SCHOOL.—Question, Sir A. Spicer (Hackney, Central); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1233

IMPORTS FROM GERMANY.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1234

REVENUE PENALTIES OF OVER £50.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1235

War Office Pensions—Case of Hugh Craig.—Question, Mr. W. Benn (Tower Hamlets, St. George's); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. 1235

**Employment of Women Bill** [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 211] .. .. .. 1235

Small Landholders (Scotland) [Salaries.]

Considered in Committee.

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That for carrying out the provisions of any Act of the present session to encourage the formation of Small Agricultural Holdings in Scotland, it is expedient to authorise—(i.) the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, of the salaries of the chairman, and of each of the other members of the Land Court; (ii.) the payment out of moneys provided by Parliament of—(a) the salaries and remuneration of the Agricultural Commissioners and other persons appointed or employed by them, and by the Land Court, and the expenses incurred by the Land Court and the Agricultural Commissioners in the execution of their duties; (b) an annual sum not exceeding eighty-five thousand pounds for the use of the Agricultural Commissioners; (c) compensation in certain cases to members and officers of the Crofters' Commission."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

*Mr. Munro Ferguson* (*Leith Burghs*) .. .. .. .. .. 1236
*Mr. Rawlinson* (*Cambridge University*) .. .. .. .. .. 1242
*Mr. Harold Cox* (*Preston*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1244
*Sir Henry Craik* (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) .. .. .. 1245
*Sir F. Banbury* (*City of London*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1247
*Mr. Morton* (*Sutherland*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1250
*Mr. Cochrane* (*Ayrshire, N.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1252
*The Secretary for Scotland* (*Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire*) .. .. .. 1257
*Lord Willoughby de Eresby* (*Lincolnshire, Horncastle*) .. .. .. 1262
*Mr. Abel Smith* (*Herts, Hertford*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1263

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) rose in his place, and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 115; Noes, 15. (Division List No. 173.)

Question put accordingly.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 118; Noes, 17. (Division List No. 174.)

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

**Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill.**—Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Sir F. Banbury (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1269
*The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1269

*Mr. Morton (Sutherland)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1270

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of nine Members, five to be nominated by the House and four by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented four clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their counsel, or agents be heard against the Bill, and counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

**Vaccination Bill**.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Sir John Batty Tuke (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities)* .. .. 1271
*Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1274

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"—(*Sir John Batty Tuke.*)

Question, proposed "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea)* 1275
*Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green, S.W.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1284
*Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities)* .. .. .. 1285
*Sir F. Banbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1286

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 122, Noes, 14. (Division List No. 175.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

**Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill**

*The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland)* .. .. .. .. .. 1291

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1292

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at nine minutes before Five o'clock till Monday next.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 27TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.: Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill. [Lords.]

Ordered, that the Bill be read a second time .. .. .. .. 1293

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill. Local Government Provisional Order (No. 13) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time to-morrow .. .. 1293

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time to-morrow .. .. 1293

**King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill.**—Read the third time, and passed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1293

**London and North Western Railway Bill.**—Read the third time, and passed. [New Title] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1294

*May* 27.] *Page*

**London United Tramways Bill**.—Read the third time, and passed .. .. 1294

**Newquay and District Water Bill** [Lords] (Prince of Wales' Consent Signified).—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments .. 1294

**Penrith Urban District Council Bill.**—Read the third time, and passed .. 1294

**Middlesbrough Corporation Bill** [Lords].—As amended, considered; to be read the third time .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1294

**Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited, Order Confirmation Bill.**—Read the third time, and passed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1294

## *PETITIONS.*

Butter and Margarine Bill.—Petition from Bermondsey, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1294

Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petitions against: From Chichester, and London; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 1294

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

Army.—Copy presented, of Additional Estimate of the Cost of the Territorial Force [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. 1294

Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906 (Industrial Diseases).—Copy presented, of Order, dated 22nd May, 1907, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 8 (6) of The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, extending the provisions of the Act to certain Industrial Diseases [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 1294

Banking and Railway Statistics (Ireland).—Copy presented, of Report on the Banking and Railway Statistics of Ireland for the half-year ended 31st December, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1294

Bann and Lough Neagh Drainage.—Copy presented, of Report to the Lord-Lieutenant, by Mr. J. D. Bell, Land Valuer, appointed by the Government to make certain valuations in connection with Sir Alexander Binnie's Report on the Bann and Lough Neagh Drainage [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1295

Irish Land Commission.—Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of November, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1295

Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks.—Copy presented, of Twenty-fourth Report of the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, with Appendices, for the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 164] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1295

National Portrait Gallery.—Copy presented, of the Fiftieth Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1906–7 [by Command] to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1295

Board of Education (Special Reports).—Copy presented, of Special Reports on Educational Subjects, Vol. 17, Schools, Public and Private, in the North of Europe [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1295

May 27.] Page

BOARD OF EDUCATION.—Copy presented, of Summary of Figures relating to State-aided Secondary Schools in England (excluding Wales and Monmouthshire), together with a Memorandum on the Management and Character of those Schools, in respect of Public Control and freedom from Denominational Restrictions [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 1295

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.—Inquiry into Charities (County of Wilts), Further Return relative thereto [ordered 9th August, 1901; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 165] .. .. 1295

*QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

MEETINGS OF LAND TAX COMMISSIONERS FOR BRIXTON DIVISION.—Question, Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. 1296

CLAIMS OF FOWLER & CO. OF CIENFUEGOS AGAINST THE SPANISH GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Seaverns; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. 1296

LIVERPOOL BONDED WAREHOUSES.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1297

OVERTIME OF LONDON CUSTOMS WATCHERS.—Question, Mr. Bowerman (Deptford); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1298

REGISTERED PARCELS POST TO CHINA.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. .. .. .. .. 1299

COMPULSORY REGISTRATION OF TITLE—WORKING OF THE ACT IN LONDON.—Question, Sir Henry Kimber (Wandsworth); Answer, Sir John Walton .. 1299

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE IRREGULARITIES IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Cleland; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1300

PRICE OF OPIUM AT CALCUTTA SALES.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1300

IMPROVEMENT OF IRISH HARBOURS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1300

IRISH ANCIENT MONUMENTS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1301

APPLICATION OF SURPLUS INCOME OF IRISH CHURCH TEMPORALITIES FUND.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1302

MAINTENANCE OF SUPREME COURTS OF JUDICATURE IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 1303

DEDUCTIONS FROM DEATH DUTY GRANT TO COUNTY WEXFORD.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. 1303

COST OF IRISH DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1304

SALE OF THE ESTATE OF MR. WESTLEY, HIGH PARK, KILTIGAN.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. 1305

*May 27.]* *Page*

## QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

BLUE-JACKETS' FREE KITS.—Question, Mr. Brooke (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1305

MIDSHIPMEN'S INSTRUCTION FEES.—Question, Mr. Brooke; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1305

NAVAL GUNNERY.—Questions, Mr. Partington (Derbyshire, High Peak), Mr. Stanger (Kensington, N.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. 1306

DESTROYERS ARMAMENTS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1306

LANCE-CORPORALS.—Questions, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) .. .. .. 1306

SOLDIERS' KITS.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. 1307

COST OF ARMY WALKING-OUT DRESS.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1307

TERRITORIAL ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1307

YEOMANRY ARMS.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1308

YEOMANRY EQUIPMENT.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. 1308

ENLISTMENT MINIMUM AGE.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1308

RAND MINE STRIKES—EMPLOYMENT OF IMPERIAL FORCES.—Questions, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme), Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.), Mr. Mackarness (Berks, Newbury), Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester), Mr. Ashley, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston), and Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answers, Mr. Haldane and the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 1309

FLOGGING IN INDIA.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. .. .. 1312

ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL, DARJEELING.—Question, Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1313

EDUCATION IN BRITISH CENTRAL AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1313

CANADIAN MAIL STEAMERS.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1313

INDIAN NATIVES IN NIGERIA.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1314

MURDER OF MR. VEAL IN NATAL.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1314

ANTI-OPIUM REMEDIES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1315

*May* 27.] *Page*

CHINESE ANTI-OPIUM MOVEMENT.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1316

INDIAN OPIUM IN CHINA.—Question, Sir H. Cotton, Mr. Theodore Taylor; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1316

SHANGHAI MUNICIPAL GAOL.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1317

SMYRNA BRIGANDAGE—MR. ABBOTT'S RANSOM.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. 1317

CONSOLS.—Question, Mr. Straus (Tower Hamlets, Mile End); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) .. .. .. 1318

MOTOR ACCIDENTS IN THE METROPOLIS.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), and Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1318

MOTOR FATALITIES.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1319

RUSSIAN SOCIAL DEMOCRATS.—Questions, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.) Mr. Cremer (Shoreditch, Haggerston), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich); Answers, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1320

LICENSED PREMISES.—Question, Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1320

BETTING BY THE WORKING CLASSES.—Question, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1321

PASSENGER TRAFFIC TO AMERICA.—Question, Mr. Fell;—Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) .. 1322

SHIPPING CLASSIFICATION.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George ..1322

DALMUIR LEVEL CROSSING FATALITY.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. 1323

BUTTER IMPORTS.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. 1323

MOTOR SPEED TESTS.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. .. 1324

EASTERN MAIL SERVICE.—Questions, Sir H. Cotton and Mr. Laidlaw (Renfrewshire, E.); Answers, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1325

LAND REGISTRATION.—Question, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough); Answer, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) .. .. .. .. 1326

KING'S BENCH DIVISION.—Questions, Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) and Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answers, Sir John Walton .. .. 1328

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL—STAFF OF DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS.—Questions, Mr. Rawlinson; Answers, Sir John Walton .. .. .. 1329

*May* 27.] Page

SHETLAND TRAWLING PROSECUTION.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) .. .. .. .. 1330

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. Bowles; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1330

CROFTERS' HOLDINGS.—Question, Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1330

ILLEGAL TRAWLING.—Questions, Mr. Weir and Mr. Stanley Wilson; Answers, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1331

CULLODEN ESTATE EVICTIONS.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 1331

DUBLIN AND BELFAST MAGISTRACY.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell (Bristol, N.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1332

IRISH LAND PURCHASE INSTALMENTS.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1332

DUBLIN REVALUATION.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1332

IRISH LAND PURCHASE.—Question, Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Mr. McKenna (for Mr. Runciman) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1333

GOVERNMENT BILLS.—Questions, Captain Craig, Mr. Walter Long (Dublin, S.), Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.), Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton), Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton), Mr. J. Randles (Cumberland, Cockermouth), and Sir Francis Channing (Northamptonshire); Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1334

THE INDIAN BUDGET.—Question, Sir Henry Cotton; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1335

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Question, Mr. Walter Long; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1336

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the introduction of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, if under discussion when the Business is postponed, be resumed and proceeded with, though opposed, after the interruption of Business."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 249; Noes, 64. (Division List No. 176) .. 1336

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) [SALARIES].

Resolution reported: "That, for carrying out the provisions of any Act of the present session to encourage the formation of Small Agricultural Holdings in Scotland, it is expedient to authorise—(i.) the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, of the salaries of the chairman and of

each of the other members of the Land Court; (ii.) the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of (*a*) the salaries and remuneration of the Agricultural Commissioners and other persons appointed or employed by them and by the Land Court, and the expenses incurred by the Land Court and the Agricultural Commissioners in the execution of their duties; (*b*) an annual sum not exceeding £85,000 for the use of the Agricultural Commissioners; (*c*) compensation in certain cases to members and officers of the Crofters Commission."

Resolution read a second time.

*Mr. Rawlinson* (*Cambridge University*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1339
*Sir F. Banbury* (*City of London*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1342

Amendment proposed—

"In Paragraph 2 (a), line 7, after the word 'Commissioners,' to insert the words 'not exceeding three thousand pounds.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*The Secretary for Scotland* (*Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire*) .. .. .. 1343
*Col. Kenyon-Slaney* (*Shropshire, Newport*) .. .. .. .. 1344
*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson* (*Lanarkshire, N.W.*) .. .. .. .. 1344

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 57; Noes, 256. (Division List No. 177.)

*Mr. Rawlinson* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1347
*Sir Henry Craik* (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) .. .. .. 1349

Amendment proposed—

"In Paragraph 2 (a), line 10, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided that the expense in connection with the Land Court shall not exceed £6,000 in any one year, and.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. Sinclair* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1350
*Mr. Walter Long* (*Dublin, S.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1350
*Sir F. Banbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1351
*Mr. Younger* (*Ayr Burghs*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1352
*Mr. J. F. Mason* (*Windsor* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1353
*Mr. Mitchell-Thomson* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1353
*Mr. Cochrane* (*Ayrshire, N.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1354
*Col. Kenyon-Slaney* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1355
*Mr. Austen Chamberlain* (*Worcestershire, E.*) .. .. .. .. 1356
*The Chancellor of the Exchequer* (*Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.*) .. .. 1358
*Capt. Craig* (*Down, E.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1359

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 79; Noes, 274. (Division List No. 178.)

*May* 27.] Page

*Mr. Rawlinson* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1363
*Sir F. Banbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1365

Amendment proposed—

> "In paragraph 2 (*a*), line 10, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that the expenses in connection with the Agricultural Commissioners shall not exceed five thousand pounds.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. Sinclair* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1366

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 273 ; Noes, 80. (Division List No. 179.)

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided :—Ayes, 83 ; Noes, 275. (Division List No. 180.)

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman claimed "That the main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided :—Ayes, 275 ; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 181.)

Small Holdings and Allotments.

*The First Commissioner of Works* (*Mr. Harcourt, Lancashire, Rossendale*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1377

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the law relating to Small Holdings and Allotments."—(*Mr. Harcourt.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1377

*Mr. Walter Long* (*Dublin, S.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1388
*Sir Walter Foster* (*Derbyshire, Ilkeston*) .. .. .. .. .. 1396
*Mr. Mildmay* (*Devonshire, Totnes*) .. .. .. .. .. 1399
*Mr. Nicholls* (*Northamptonshire, N.*) .. .. .. .. .. 1406

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

**London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill** [By Order].—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [9th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. J. Ward* (*Stoke-on-Trent*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1407
*Sir Edwin Cornwall* (*Bethnal Green, N.E.*) .. .. .. .. 1407
*Mr. Cave* (*Surrey, Kingston*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1413
*The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade* (*Mr. Kearley, Devonport*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1414

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of nine Members, five to be nominated by the House and four by the Committee of Selection."—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Ordered, That all petitions already presented against the Bill be referred to the Committee; that the petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their counsel, or agents, be heard against the Bill, and counsel be heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Courthope*).

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee that if any power be conferred upon the London County Council to transfer or lease to any company, local authority, body, or person any of the powers, duties or liabilities entrusted to it by this Bill, the conditions upon which such power shall be exercised shall be embodied either in this or a subsequent Bill."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS.

Postponed proceeding on Question, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Small Holdings and Allotments," resumed.

*Mr. Nicholls* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1415
*Mr. Llewellyn Williams* (*Carmarthen District*) .. .. .. .. 1419
*Mr. Jesse Collings* (*Birmingham, Bordesley*) .. .. .. .. 1421
*Mr. Winfrey* (*Norfolk, S.W.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1428
*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1437
*The Solicitor-General* (*Sir W. Robson, South Shields*) .. .. .. 1439
*Lord Willoughby de Eresby* (*Lancashire, Horncastle*) .. .. .. 1442
*Mr. Wedgwood* (*Newcastle-under-Lyme*) .. .. .. .. .. 1445
*Mr. Hunt* (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1447
*Mr. J. D. White* (*Dumbartonshire*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1448

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Harcourt, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Burns, Sir Edward Strachey, Mr. Lambert, and Mr. Solicitor-General.

**Small Holdings and Allotments Bill.**—"To amend the Law relating to Small Holdings and Allotments," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 212.]

**Municipal Elections Bill.**—Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1448

**Public Rights of Way (No. 2 Bill).**—Read a second time and committed to a Standing Committee .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1448

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House, without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS: TUESDAY, 28TH MAY, 1907.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 2) [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 4) [H.L.]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4).

Also the certificate that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in respect of the petition for the following Bill:—Alton Military Hospital.

Also that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in respect of the petition for additional provision in the following Bill:—Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water [H.L.].

And also the certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Great Northern and City Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. .. 1449

**Harrison's Patent Bill** [H.L.]; General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.], now Coventry Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Midland Railway Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1449

**Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill** [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, etc.) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Committed . 1449

**Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill**; Leeds Corporation Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill; London and North-Western Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Penrith Urban District Council Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read $1^a$, and referred to the Examiners .. .. 1449

**Baines' Name Bill** [H.L.]; Borax Consolidated Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1450

**Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill** [H.L.]; Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [H.L.]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments: The said Amendments considered, and agreed to .. .. .. .. .. 1450

**Birmingham Corporation Bill** [H.L.]; Newquay and District Water Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments .. .. 1450

**Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill.**—Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to .. .. .. .. .. .. 1450

**Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited, Order Confirmation Bill.**—Brought from the Commons, read $1^a$: to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act 1899), deemed to have been read $2^a$. (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 57.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1450

## *PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).*

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the following Papers, having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty, had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz.—

Trade Reports—I. Annual Series.

No. 3791. France (Cherbourg.) (17th May.)

No. 3792. Russia. (Rostov-on-Don). (22nd May.)

No. 3793. United States (States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho).

No. 3794. United States (New York).

No. 3795. Italy (Finances).

No. 3796. Germany.

No. 3797. Russia.

No. 3798. Turkey (Beirut and Coast of Syria). (23rd May.)

No. 3799. Italy (Lombardy). (24th May.)

No. 3800. China (Wuhu).

No. 3801. China (Hankow).

No. 3802. China (Nanking).

No. 3803. Japan (North Formosa). (25th May.)

II. Miscellaneous Series.

No. 660. Japanese Paper Mills. (23rd May.)

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries.

I. Annual Report of proceedings under the Tithe Acts, 1836 to 1891, the Copyhold Act, 1894, the Inclosure Acts, 1845 to 1899, the Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1883 to 1900, the Drainage and Improvement of Land Acts, the Universities and College Estates Acts, 1858 to 1898, the Glebe Lands Act, 1888, and certain other Acts, for the year 1906. (17th May.)

II. Memorandum by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries upon the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 1907 (H.L. No. 24). (22nd May.)

Board of Education.

I. (List of Public Elementary Schools, England).—List of public elementary schools and certified efficient schools in England (excluding Monmouthshire) on 1st August, 1906. (22nd May.)

II. (County of Cornwall.—Endowed Charities (Elementary Education). Report made to the Board of Education in the result of an inquiry into endowments subject to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894, and appropriated in whole or in part to purposes of elementary education in the County of Cornwall, or in any part thereof. (24th May.)

III. (Special Reports, Volume 17).—Special reports on educational subjects, Volume 17. Schools, public and private, in the North of Europe.

IV. (Secondary Schools).—Summary of figures relating to state-aided secondary schools in England (excluding Wales and Monmouthshire), together with a memorandum on the management and character of those schools in respect of public control and freedom from denominational restrictions. (25th May.)

Education (Scotland).

I. Thirty-fourth Annual Report, by the Accountant for Scotland, to the Scottish Education Department. (22nd May.)

II. Report of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, with Appendix (1906–1907). (24th May.)

Congestion in Ireland (Royal Commission).—Fourth Report of the Commissioners, with Appendix (Minutes of Evidence taken in London, 14th to 23rd February, 1907, and documents relating thereto). (22nd May.)

Aliens Act, 1905.—Return of alien passengers brought to the United Kingdom from ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ended 31st March, 1906, together with the number of expulsion orders made during that period requiring aliens to leave the United Kingdom. (22nd May.)

*May* 28.] *Page.*

EMIGRATION.—Memorandum on the history and functions of the Emigrants' Information Office. (22nd May.)

TREATY SERIES, No. 13 (1907).—Treaty between the United Kingdom and Peru for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals, signed at Lima, 26th January, 1904 (ratifications exchanged at Lima, 30th November, 1906). (23rd May.)

LUNACY (SCOTLAND )ACT. —Forty-ninth Annual Report of the General Board of Commissioners in Lunacy for Scotland. (24th May).

TRADE.—Annual statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with foreign countries and British Possessions, 1906, compared with the four preceding years: Volume II. (Abstract and detailed tables of trade with each country and at each port) and miscellaneous tables. (24th May.)

ARMY.—Additional Estimate of the cost of the Territorial Force (in continuation of [Cd. 3296]). (24th May.)

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906 (INDUSTRIAL DISEASES).—Order, dated 22nd May, 1907, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 8 (6) of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, extending the provisions of the Act to certain industrial diseases. (25th May.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. .. 1450

### *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

NATIONAL GALLERY, IRELAND.—Report of the Director to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1906 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1453

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.—Minutes of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 1907.

Papers laid before the Colonial Conference, 1907 .. .. .. .. 1453

TRADE REPORTS, ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3804. Spain (Galicia, the Asturias, and Leon, 1906).

No. 3805. France (Nantes, 1906) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1453

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.—Fiftieth Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1906–1907 .. .. .. .. .. 1453

FISHERIES (IRELAND).—Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1905; Part II. Scientific Investigations .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1453

BANKING AND RAILWAY STATISTICS (IRELAND).—December, 1906 .. .. 1453

IRISH LAND COMMISSION.—Returns of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903—During the month of July, 1906.

During the month of October, 1906.

During the month of November, 1906 .. .. .. .. .. 1453

*May* 28.] *Page*

BANN AND LOUGH NEAGH DRAINAGE.—Report to the Lord-Lieutenant, by Mr. J. D. Bell, land valuer, appointed by Government to make certain valuations in connection with Sir Alexander Binnie's Report on the Bann and Lough Neagh Drainage.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. 1454

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1875.—Order in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, amending the Order in Council of 28th July, 1893, relating to the Circuits of the Judges, and revoking the Order in Council of 1st March, 1907 1454

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Order in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, entitled "The Persian Coast and Islands Order in Council, 1907" .. .. 1454

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 AND 1869.—Order in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, sanctioning a further rearrangement of Greenwich Hospital Pensions 1454

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1906.—Order in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, for giving effect to a Treaty of Extradition between His Majesty and the President of the Republic of Peru .. .. .. .. .. .. 1454

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.—Orders in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, sanctioning—The extension of the system of repayment of cost of forwarding baggage to officers appointed from, or discharged to, half-pay.

The repayment of expenses for subsistence to candidates for entry into His Majesty's Navy, subject to certain conditions .. .. .. 1454

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.—Order dated 17th May, 1907, entitled the Glasgow Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1907 .. .. .. .. 1454

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.—(Homework)—Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108, and 110 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and revoking the Order of the 15th August, 1905.

(Particulars of Piece Work Wages)—Two Orders made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying with modification the provisions of Section 116 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, to non-textile factories and workshops in which certain classes of industries are carried on, and to out-workers employed in those industries 1454

PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS.—Twenty-fourth Report of the Comptroller General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, with Appendices, for the year 1906 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1455

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION ACTS, 1881 AND 1892.—Forty-third Annual Report on Alkali, etc., Works, by the Chief Inspector; proceedings during the year 1906 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1455

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.—Return showing, up to 31st March, 1907:—

I. The amount of Consolidated Stock; The application of the money raised by such stock: The sums carried to the Consolidated Loans Fund; The application of the Consolidated Loans Fund: An estimate of the expenditure of the Council for all purposes, for the year ending 31st March, 1908.

II. All moneys raised by the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Council since the passing of the Act for the purposes mentioned in the Act; Particulars in relation to every parish, district, union, or place in respect whereof a loan has been obtained from the Metropolitan Board of Works or the Council since the passing of the Act.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1455

MEDWAY CONSERVANCY.—Statement of receipts and expenditure by the conservators of the River Medway, for the year ended 25th March, 1907: Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table .. .. .. .. 1455

**Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill.** [H.L.]. —[SECOND READING.]Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*Lord Ampthill* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1456

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

*Lord Muskerry* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1457
*Lord Inverclyde* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1458
*The Earl of Granard* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1458
*Lord Ampthill* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1459

On Question, Bill read 2ª.

Moved, "That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, Two o'clock.

---

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 28TH MAY, 1907.

The House met a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO NOT COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have not been complied with, viz.:—Selsey Water Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1460

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).—MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following

May. 28.] Page

Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow .. .. .. 1460

**Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill** [Lords]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed .. .. .. .. .. .. 1460

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill;** Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1460

## *PETITIONS.*

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill.—Petition from Dewsbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1461

Education (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions for alteration; From Dunnottar; Kilrenny; Newburgh; Perth; and Rothes; to lie upon the Table .. 1461

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1461

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petitions against; From Cambridge (three); Edmonton; Hammersmith; Harlow; Hornsey; South Croydon; Southsea; and Tintagel; to lie upon the Table .. .. 1461

Pauper Lunatics (Cost of Maintenance).—Petition from Merthyr Tydvil, for legislation; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1461

Small Holdings (Scotland) Bill.—Petition from Perth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1461

Vaccination Acts.—Petition from Eastbourne, for repeal; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1461

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

Factory and Workshop Acts (Homework).—Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108, and 110 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and revoking the Order of the 15th August, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 1461

Factory and Workshop Acts (Particulars of Piece Work Wages).—Copies presented, of Two Orders made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying with modifications the provisions of Section 116 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, to Non-Textile Factories and Workshops in which certain classes of industries are carried on, and to out-workers employed in those industries [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1461

*May.* 28.]

Page

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3804 and 3805 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1462

FISHERIES (IRELAND).—Copy presented of Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1905, Part II., Scientific Investigation [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1462

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).—Copy presented of Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1462

RENTS AND ROYALTIES ARISING FROM MINES UNDER THE SEA.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th May; *Mr. George Roberts*]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1462

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.—Copy presented, of an Order dated 17th May, 1907, entitled the Glasgow Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1462

EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1895.—Copy presented of Order in Council of 7th May, 1907, for giving effect to a Treaty of Extradition between His Majesty and the President of the Republic of Peru [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1462

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 7th May, 1907, entitled the Persian Coast and Islands Order in Council, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1462

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1875.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 7th May, 1907, amending the Order in Council of 28th July, 1893, relating to the Circuits of the Judges, and revoking the Order in Council of 1st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 1462

GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 AND 1869.—Copy presented, of Order in Council of 7th May, 1907, sanctioning a further rearrangement of Greenwich Hospital Pensions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1463

NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.—Copies presented, of Orders in Council dated 7th May, 1907, sanctioning: 1. The extension of the system of repayment of cost of forwarding baggage to officers appointed from or discharged to Half-Pay; 2. The repayment of expenses for subsistence to candidates for entry into His Majesty's Navy subject to certain conditions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. 1463

EAST INDIA (STATE PRISONERS).—Address for "Return of all State prisoners in India and Burmah, giving the date of their imprisonment and the grounds of their imprisonment."—(*Mr. Morton*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1463

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

THE DOCK BOOK.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1463

ASSISTANT ENGINEERS IN THE NAVY.—Question, Mr. Hart Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. 1463

DOG LICENCE CASE AT LEIGH PETTY SESSIONAL COURT.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. 1464

EXCLUSION OF CANADIAN LIVE CATTLE.—Question, Mr. Mond (Chester); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. 1465

CONDITION OF FACTORY LABOUR IN INDIA.—Question, Sir Andrew Torrance (Glasgow, Central); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. 1465

WORKMEN'S TRAINS FROM GRAYS AND TILBURY.—Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. 1466

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT—CASUAL WORKMEN.—Question, Mr. L. Haslam (Monmouth Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. 1466

EMPLOYMENT IN THE BUILDING TRADE.—Question, Captain Faber (Hants, Andover); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. 1466

POOR RELIEF BY THE NEW FOREST GUARDIANS.—Question, Mr. Bennett, (Oxfordshire, Woodstock); Answer, Mr. John Burns.. .. .. .. 1467

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

SUMMER NAVAL MANŒUVRES.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. .. 1467

ROYAL MARINES.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1468

YEOMANRY ALLOWANCES.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, The Secretary of State or War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington).. .. 1468

NAIROBI PRISON.—Questions, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answers, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1469

EGYPTIAN STATE RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1469

EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT SERVICE—NATIVE CANDIDATES.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. .. 1469

EGYPTIAN RAILWAY ADVERTISEMENTS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1470

HAGUE CONFERENCE.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1471

BAHR-EL-GHAZEL.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. 1471

LADO ENCLAVE.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1471

COST OF CUSTOMS COLLECTION.—Question, Mr. Mond (Chester); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) .. .. .. 1472

*May* 28.]

Page

UNCLAIMED DIVIDENDS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1472

TAXES ON FOOD AND DRINK.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1472

THE EDALJI CASE.—Questions, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) and Mr. Pike Pease; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1473

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Questions, Mr. Glover (St. Helens) and Mr. Fenwick (Northumberland, Wansbeck); Answers, Mr. Gladstone .. .. 1473

INFANTS IN PUBLIC HOUSES.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Mr. Gladstone.. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1474

HULL DOCKS DREDGINGS.—Questions, Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness); Answers, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1474

EXPENDITURE ON THE UNEMPLOYED.—Question, Mr. Haddock (Lancashire, North Lonsdale); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1475

COST OF EDUCATION IN GLAMORGANSHIRE.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1475

COMPULSORY SCHOOL ABSENCE AND THE EDUCATION GRANT.—Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Mr. Lough.. .. .. .. .. 1476

KEISS SCHOOL BOARD.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire).. .. .. .. 1477

EMBO PIER, SUTHERLAND.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherlannd); Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .., .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1477

DURNESS-THURSO STEAMBOAT SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1477

BOYLE UNTENANTED LANDS.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. .. .. 1478

IRISH SWINE—INSPECTION OF CARCASES.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1478

NEW MEMBER SWORN.—The right hon. Henry Chaplin, for the county of Surrey (North-Eastern or Wimbledon Division) .. .. .. .. .. 1477

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Public Health Bill): Mr. Secretary Gladstone; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Public Health Bill): Mr. Burns.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee A the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Public Health Bill) :—Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. W. Wilson, Mr. Staveley-Hill, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Corrie Grant, Mr. Hall, Mr. Helme, Mr. Jowett, Mr. Layland-Barratt, Mr. Samuel Roberts, Mr. Robinson, Captain Baring, Mr. Charles Nicholson, Mr. Manfield, and Dr. Macnamara.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill) : Mr. Burns and Dr. Macnamara ; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill) : Mr. Secretary Gladstone and Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had added to Standing Committee B the following fifteen Members in respect of the Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill) :—Mr. Du Cros, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Steadman, Mr. Bennett, Sir Edward Tennant, Mr. Arnold Herbert, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Wiles, Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Marnham, Mr. Duncan Schwann, Viscount Turnour, and Mr. Lynch.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Vaccination Bill) : Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Kearley ; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Vaccination Bill) : Mr. Burns and Dr. Macnamara.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had added to Standing Committee C the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Vaccination Bill) :—Mr. Lupton, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Enoch Edwards, Mr. Wedgwood, Captain Kincaid-Smith, Mr. Sears, Mr. Horniman, Sir William Collins, Sir John Tuke, Mr. Cave, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. Houston, Mr. Walrond, Mr. Ffrench, and Mr. Flavin.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A : Mr. Shackleton ; and had appointed in substitution : Mr. Macpherson.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C : Mr. George Roberts ; and had appointed in substitution : Mr. Shackleton.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee B : Mr. Henniker Heaton.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A : Mr. James Mason ; and had appointed in substitution : Mr. Rothschild.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee ; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill) : Mr. Bright ; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill) : Mr. Charles Roberts.

Reports to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1479

*NEW BILL.*

**Purity of Milk Supplies (Scotland) Bill.**—"To ensure the purity of Milk Supplies of the rural and urban districts of Scotland," presented by Mr. Watt; supported by Sir Andrew Torrance, Mr. Charles Price, Mr. M'Callum, and Mr. Halley Stewart; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 213.] .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1480

**Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.**

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:

*Sir Charles Dilke* (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) .. .. .. .. 1481

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the words 'His Majesty's military forces other than the Regulars,' and insert the words 'the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*The Secretary of State for War* (*Mr. Haldane, Haddington*) .. .. 1483
*Sir Howard Vincent* (*Sheffield Central*) .. .. .. .. 1484
*Sir F. Channing* (*Northamptonshire, E.*) .. .. .. .. .. 1485
*Mr. Arthur Lee* (*Hants, Fareham*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1485
*Mr. C. P. Allen* (*Gloucestershire, Stroud*) .. .. .. .. .. 1486
*Sir Gilbert Parker* (*Gravesend*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1486
*Colonel Herbert* (*Monmouthshire, S.*) .. .. .. .. .. 1487
*Mr. A. J. Balfour* (*City of London*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1487
*Mr. Haldane* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1488
*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney* (*Shropshire, Newport*) .. .. .. .. 1489
*Viscount Morpeth* (*Birmingham, S.*) .. .. .. .. .. 1489
*Mr. McCrae* (*Edinburgh, E.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1489
*Major Seely* (*Liverpool, Abercromby*) .. .. .. .. .. 1490
*Mr. J. Ward* (*Stoke-on-Trent*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1491
*Mr. Stanley Wilson* (*Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness*) .. .. .. .. 1491
*Sir Gilbert Parker* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1492

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 212; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 182.)

*Mr. F. E. Smith* (*Liverpool, Walton*) .. .. .. .. .. 1495

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'Regulars' to insert the words 'and the Militia.'"—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*May* 28.] *Page*

*Mr. Haldane* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1501
*Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1507
*Captain Faber (Hants, Andover)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1512
*Viscount Morpeth* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1513
*The Under Secretary of State for India (Mr. Chas. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.)* 1516
*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport)* .. .. .. .. 1521
*Sir J. Dickson-Poynder (Wiltshire, Chippenham)* .. .. .. .. 1523
*Sir Gilbert Parker* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1525
*Sir Charles Dilke* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1528
*Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury)* .. .. .. .. 1528
*Mr. Seddon (Lancashire, Newton)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1531
*Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool)* .. .. .. .. .. 1532
*Mr. Guy Baring (Winchester)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1534

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 80; Noes, 260. (Division List No. 183.)
*Viscount Valentia (Oxford)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1537

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'Regulars' to insert the words 'and Yeomanry.'"—(*Viscount Valentia.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*Mr. Haldane* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1542
*Lord Willoughby de Eresby (Lincolnshire, Horncastle)* .. .. .. 1544
*Mr. Guest (Cardiff District)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1545
*Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1547
*Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness)* .. .. .. .. 1549
*Mr. Verney (Bucks, N.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1551
*Col. Warde (Kent, Medway)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1552
*Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1554
*Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley)* .. .. .. .. .. 1555
*Major Seely* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1558
*Mr. Chas. Hobhouse* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1561
*Mr. Hunt* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1563
*Captain Craig (Down, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1564
*Mr. A. J. Balfour* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1566
*Mr. Haldane* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1566
*Mr. Guest* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1566
*Col. Kenyon-Slaney* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1567

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 89; Noes, 296. (Division List No. 184.)

And, it being half past ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 6th May, successively to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, and on the Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 1, after the word 'county,' to insert the words 'or such other person as the Army Council may think fit.'"—(*Mr. Haldane.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 314 ; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 185.)

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2 :

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 9, to leave out from the word 'Establishing,' to end of line 10, and insert the words 'or assisting cadet battalions and corps and also rifle clubs, provided that no financial assistance shall be given by an association in respect of any person in a battalion or corps in a school in receipt of a Parliamentary grant until such person has attained the age of sixteen.'"—(*Mr. Haldane.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 291 ; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 186.)

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Whereupon the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again To-morrow.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES (EXPENSES).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That is it expedient to authorise the payment out of money voted by Parliament for Army services of necessary expenditure incurred by associations in pursuance of any Act of the present session to provide for the re-organisation of His Majesty's military forces, and for that purpose to authorise the establishment of County Associations and the raising and maintenance of a Territorial Force and to amend the Acts relating to the Reserve Forces."—(*Mr. Haldane.*)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 6th May, to put forthwith the Question.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 294 ; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 187.)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-six minutes after Eleven o'clock.

## HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 29TH MAY, 1907.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

**Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill** [H.L.].—(Petition for additional Provision); Alton Military Hospital. (Petition for Bill); Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next .. .. .. .. 1585

**Wisbech Water Bill** [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments .. .. .. 1585

**Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill** [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons .. 1585

**Maidstone Gas Bill.**—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1585

**Birmingham Corporation Bill** [H.L.]; Newquay and District Water Bill [H.L.].—Commons' Amendments considered, and agreed to .. .. .. .. 1585

**Aberdeen Corporation Bill** [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1585

### *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

Elementary School Teachers Superannuation Act, 1898.—Rules in lieu of Rules 6 (3) and 7 (2), of the Elementary School Teachers Superannuation Rules, 1899 .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1585

National Debt Annuities.—Account of the gross amount of all bank annuities and any annuities for terms of years, transferred, and of all sums of money paid to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, and the gross amount of annuities for lives and for terms of years which have been granted for the same, and contracts for payments on death which have been made within the year ended 5th January, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1585

Asiatics in the Transvaal.

*Lord Ampthill* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1586

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for further Papers in regard to the Transvaal Registration Bill."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

*The Secretary of State for the Colonies* (*The Earl of Elgin*) .. .. .. 1591
*The Marquess of Lansdowne* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1596

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

Technical Instruction to Soldiers.

*Lord Monkswell* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1599

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to the answers received to the circular issued by the War Office on the 31st October last, to the various military commands with reference to giving technical instruction to soldiers to fit them for civil life."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

Page

*The Under-Secretary of State for War* (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) .. .. 1603
*The Earl of Donoughmore* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1606
*Lord Monkswell* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1607

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

**Municipal Representation Bill** [H.L.].—The Lord Bishop of Bristol added to the Select Committee .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1607

TURKEY AND MACEDONIA.—On the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

*Lord Newton* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1608
*The Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* (*Lord Fitzmaurice*) .. 1608

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 29TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *NEW WRITS.*

NEW WRITS.—For County of Rutland in the room of the right hon. George Henry Finch, deceased.

County of Middlesex (Hornsey Division) Captain Charles Barrington Balfour (Manor of Northstead).—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*) .. .. 1608

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills; That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:—Alton Military Hospital Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1608

**Great Central Railway Bill** (KING'S CONSENT SIGNIFIED).—Bill read the third time, and passed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1609

**Armagh Urban District Council Bill**.—As amended, considered. To be read the third time .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1609

**Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill**.—Read a second time, and committed .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1609

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have agreed to Amendments to—Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords], without Amendment. .. .. .. ..

*May* 29.] *Page*

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to Richard Harrison for an invention for improvements in or connected with elastic wheels applicable to motor and other vehicles." [Harrison's Patent Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, to issue Insurance Coupons ; and for other purposes." [General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the time limited by the Heywood and Middleton Water Board Act, 1901, for the construction of waterworks, to confer further powers upon the Heywood and Middleton Water Board with respect to their water undertaking; and for other purposes." [Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords.]

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Pontypridd Urban District Council in regard to the appropriation and use of lands, to make further provision in regard to their gas undertaking ; and for other purposes." [Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the North British Railway Company to construct a new dock, a railway, and other works at Methil, to confer further powers on the North British Railway Company with reference to their undertaking and upon that company, the Caledonian Railway Company, and the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Company with reference to undertakings in which those companies are interested, to authorise the Burntisland Harbour Commissioners to lease lands for graving dock ; and for other purposes." [North British Railway Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled "An Act to confer further powers on the Mayor, Alderman, and Citizens of the city of Coventry in relation to their water undertaking ; to authorise the supply to them of water by the Lord Mayor, Alderman, and Citizens of the city of Birmingham ; to extend the area of supply under the Coventry Electric Lighting Order, 1891 ; and for other purposes." [Coventry Corporation Water Bill [Lords] now Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer additional powers upon the Midland Railway Company and upon that Company and the Great Western Railway Company and upon the South Yorkshire Joint Line Committee and upon the Cheshire Lines Committee for the construction of works and the acquisition of lands ; to make provision for transferring the Limavady and Dungiven Railway to the Midland Railway Company and to confer powers upon that Company and the Great Central and Hull and Barnsley Railway Companies with respect to certain authorised railways of the Great Central and Hull and Barnsley Railway Companies ; and for other purposes." [Midland Railway Bill [Lords.] .. .. .. .. .. 1609

HARRISON'S PATENT BILL [LORDS] ; General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, Bill [Lords] ; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords] ; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [Lords] ; North British Railway Bill [Lords] ; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [Lords] ; now Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords] ; Midland Railway Bill [Lords].—read the first time ; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1610

May 29.]

Page

### PETITIONS.

CONGO FREE STATE.—Petition from Muswell Hill, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1611

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions for alteration: From Forres; Leith; and, Stornoway; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1611

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.—petitions against: From Royton; Stratford-on-Avon; and, Wigan; to lie upon the Table .. .. 1611

LICENSED PREMISES (EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN). Three Petitions from Chepping Wycombe, for legislation; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. 1611

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Hampstead; London; and, Paisley; to lie upon the Table .. .. 1611

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petitions against: From Cramlington; Hitcham; Norwich; Plympton; and Shireoaks; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1611

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from Keighley, for legislation; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1611

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from Leicester, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1611

WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.—Petition from Tooting, in favour; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1611

### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NATIONAL DEBT ANNUITIES.—Account presented, of the Gross Amount of all Bank Annuities and any Annuities for terms of years transferred, and of all sums of money paid to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, and the Gross Amount of Annuities for Lives and for terms of years, etc., granted within the year ended 5th January, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 166.] .. .. .. .. 1612

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION RULES.—Copy presented, of Rules in lieu of Rules 6 (3) and 7 (2) of the Elementary School Teachers' Superannuation Rules, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1612

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.—Copy presented, of Minutes of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. 1612

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.—Copy presented, of Papers laid before the Colonial Conference, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. .. .. 1612

ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.—Order [15th May] for presenting an Address for a Return relative thereto, read, and discharged; and instead thereof:—East India (Plague),—Address for "Return of the Memorandum of the Royal College of Physicians, in July, 1905, on Plague."—(*Dr. Rutherford*) .. 1612

ENGLISH GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (POWERS IN IRELAND).—Return ordered, "giving the names of Government Departments or Authorities in England which now exercise powers in or in relation to Ireland, either directly or indirectly."—(*Captain Craig*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1612

LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION)—Return ordered, "showing the extent to which, and the manner in which, local authorities in Scotland have allocated and applied funds to the purposes of Technical Education during the year ending the 15th day of May, 1907, under the following Acts: The Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890; The Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892; The Technical Schools (Scotland) Act, 1887; The Technical Instruction Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1892; and Public Libraries Acts."—(*Mr. Sinclair*) .. .. 1612

*QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

MAINTENANCE OF ROADS ALTERED IN CONNECTION WITH RAILWAYS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 1613

POST OFFICE ESTIMATE—DEPRECIATION OF BUILDINGS, ETC.—Question, Mr. Walrond (Devonshire, Tiverton); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton .. .. 1613

CLOSE TIME FOR SALMON IN THE BLACKWATER.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1614

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS—CASE OF JOHN O. REGAN.—Question, Mr. William Abraham (Cork County, N.E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 1615

INFANT MORTALITY.—Question, Mr. Ridsdale (Brighton); Answer, Mr. John Burns .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1616

VISIT OF LORDS OF THE ADMIRALTY TO PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. .. 1621

PAY OF CIVIL SERVICE PENSION TO RESIDENTS ABROAD.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor (Wicklow); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. .. .. .. .. 1621

BERKHAMSTEAD GRAMMAR SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Walrond; Answer, Sir John Walton .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1622

LAND REVENUE OF INDIA.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington); Answer, Mr. Secretary Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1622

ARMY EXPENDITURE IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Secretary Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1623

LAND REVENUE OF RAWAL PINDI DISTRICT.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Secretary Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1624

NET REVENUE FROM IRRIGATION IN INDIA.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Secretary Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1626

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MILITARY OFFICERS IN BOMBAY POLITICAL SERVICE.—Question, Sir Seymour King (Hull, Central); Answer, Mr. Secretary Morley 1627

PAY OF WOOLWICH ARSENAL LABOURERS.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Secretary Haldane .. .. .. .. .. 1627

*QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

KILCREGGAN FORT, DUMBARTONSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) .. 1627

*May* 29.] Page

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS.—Questions, Sir George Scott Robertson (Bradford, Central) Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answers, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. 1628

TERRITORIAL ARMY OFFICERS AND COMMISSIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.—Question, Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1628

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.—Question, Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1629

INDIAN CANTONMENT ACT.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) .. .. 1629

CUTCH RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. 1630

LUCKNOW CANTONMENT MAGISTRATES.—Questoin, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Morley1630

PUNJAB LAND COLONISATION BILL.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1630

BRITISH-INDIAN SUBJECTS IN GERMAN COLONIES.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. 1631

BOMBAY-SIND RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Weir; Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. 1631

RAWAL PINDI PUBLIC MEETING.—Question, Mr. C. J. O'Donnell (Newington, Walworth), Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Morley .. 1632

RAWAL PINDI RIOTS.—Question, Dr. Rutherford; Answer, Mr. Morley .. .. 1633

LALU LAJPAT RAI.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.), Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answers, Mr. Morley .. .. .. .. .. 1634

STEAMSHIP COMMUNICATION WITH EAST AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1634

THE VISIT OF THE COLONIAL PREMIERS.—Questions, Mr. Arthur Lee, Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answers, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. 1635

REPORT OF THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. 1636

THE RAND MINERS' STRIKE.—Questions, Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury), Mr. Lea, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington), Mr. Walsh (Lancashire, Ince), Sir Howard Vincent; Answers, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. 1638

DINUZULU.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1638

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE—DELEGATES' POWERS.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1639

SHANGHAI OPIUM TRAFFIC.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1639

BRITISH SUBJECTS IN THE CONGO FREE STATE.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1640

May 29.] Page

British Consular Staff in the Upper Congo.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Churchill .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1640

Metropolitan Police—Sunday Duty.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye), Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. .. .. .. .. 1641

National Physique.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 1641

Foreign Lottery Circulars.—Question, Mr. G. A. Hardy (Suffolk, Stowmarket); Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. .. .. .. .. .. 1641

Newbury Railway Station.—Question, Mr. Mackarness; Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) .. 1642

Port of London.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1643

Oban Post Office.—Question, Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. .. 1643

Salterhebble Church of England School.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry), Mr. McKenna, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley), and Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans); Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) .. .. 1645

School Accommodation.—Question, Mr. Courthope and Lord Balcarres; Answer, Mr McKenna .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1646

South Kensington Museum.—Free Nights—Question, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham); Answer, Mr. McKenna .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1646

Foreign Hops.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) .. .. .. .. 1647

Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1647

Proposed Irish Council.—Question, Lord Balcarres; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. .. .. .. .. 1647

Mr. Justice Ross and Disorder in Ireland.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid), Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 1648

Arson in Kildysart.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 1648

Mr. P. J. Kelly, J. P.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 1649

Roscomroe Disturbances.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1649

Royal Irish Constabulary.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1650

Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1650

*May* 29.] *Page*

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1650

IRISH LAND PURCHASE, ADVANCES BY THE ESTATE COMMISSIONERS.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. ..1651

IRISH LAND PURCHASE AGREEMENTS FOR SALE.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1651

BELFAST RESIDENT MAGISTRATES.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1652

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES IN CONNAUGHT.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1652

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY AND GRAZING FARM DISPUTES.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. 1653

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY RESERVE.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell.. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1653

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY RECRUITS.—Question, Mr. Charles Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1653

LOUGHREA RAIDS.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 1654

ATHENRY OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. .. 1654

UNLAWFUL ASSEMBLY TRIAL IN THE WEST OF IRELAND.—Questions, Captain Craig, and Mr. Moore; Answers, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1655

INDIAN BUDGET DEBATE.—Question, Sir H. Cotton; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman) .. 1656

LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire), Mr. Barrie and Mr. Moore; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1656

ALL BRITISH MAIL ROUTE.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. .. .. .. .. .. 1656

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill): Sir Henry Norman; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill): Mr. Joseph Pease.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added the following Member to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (in respect of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill): Lord Willoughby de Eresby.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Vaccination Bill): Sir Edward Strachey; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Attorney-General.

Reports to lie upon the Table .. .. .. .. .. .. 1657

May 29.] Page

*NEW BILL.*

**Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill.**—"To amend the Injured Animal Act, 1894," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Sir William Brampton Gurdon and Sir Frederick Banbury; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 214] .. .. 1657

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES (EXPENSES).—Resolution reported: "That it is expedient to authorise the payment out of money voted by Parliament for Army services of necessary expenditure incurred by associations in pursuance of any Act of the present session to provide for the reorganisation of His Majesty's military forces, and for that purpose to authorise the establishment of county associations and the raising and maintenance of a Territorial Force and to amend the Acts relating to the Reserve Forces."

Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

*The Financial Secretary to the War Office (Mr. Buchanan, Perthshire, E.)* 1658
*Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean)* .. .. .. 1660
*Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.)* .. .. .. .. .. 1670
*Mr. McCrae (Edinburgh, E.)* .. .. .. .. .. .. 1673
*The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington,)* .. .. 1678
*Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.)* .. .. .. 1684
*Mr. Goddard (Ipswich)* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1690
*Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central)* .. .. .. .. .. 1691
*The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.)* .. 1693
*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport)* .. .. .. .. 1696
*Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley)* .. .. .. .. .. 1698

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 212; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 188.)

**Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.**

(In Committee.)

[Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

Clause 3:

*Mr. Victor Cavendish.* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1707

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 25, to leave out the words 'for Army purposes.'" —(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*Mr. Buchanan* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1708

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye)* .. . .. .. .. .. 1708

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 3, page 4, line 26, to leave out the words "in the opinion of the Army Council.' "—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question proposed, That the words proposed, to be left out stand part of the clause."

*Mr. Buchanan* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1710
*Mr. Victor Cavendish* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1710
*Mr. Lief Jones* (*Westmorland, Appleby*) .. .. .. .. .. 1710
*Mr. Forster* (*Kent, Sevenoaks*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1711

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 200 ; Noes, 40. (Division List No. 189.)

*Lord Valentia* (*Oxford*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1713

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 3, page 4, line 27, to leave out the word 'necessary.' and to insert the word 'whole.' "—(*Viscount Valentia.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

*Mr. Buchanan* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1715
*Captain Craig* (*Down, E.*) .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1715

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Mr. Victor Cavendish* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1716

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 3, page 4, line 34, at end, to insert the words 'and the Treasury.' "

Question proposed, "That these words be there inserted."

*Mr. Buchanan* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1717
*Sir F. Banbury* (*City of London*) .. .. .. .. .. .. 1718
*Captain Craig* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1719

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 42 ; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 190.)

*Mr. Victor Cavendish* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1721

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, at end, to insert the words 'after the sanction of the Treasury has been obtained.' "—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

*May* 29.] Page

*Mr. Buchanan* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1723
*Mr. Austen Chamberlain* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1723
*Mr. Haldane* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1725
*Mr. McCrae* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1726
*Sir Charles Dilke* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1727

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*Viscount Castlereagh* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1727

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 3, page 3, line 1, to leave out Sub-section (4)."

Question proposed, "That Subsection (4) stand part of the clause."

*Mr. Haldane* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1728
*Colonel Kenyon-Slaney* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1729
*Sir F. Banbury* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1729
*Mr. Austen Chamberlain* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1730
*Mr. Haldane* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1730
*Captain Craig* .. .. .. .. .. .. .. .. 1731

And, it being half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 6th May, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That Subsection (4) stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 307 ; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 191.)

The Chairman then proceeded to put successively the Questions necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded.

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 298 ; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 192.)

Clause 4 :

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 298 ; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 193.)

Whereupon the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress ; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at fourteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

End of Table of Contents to Vol. CLXXIV.

THE

# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(*AUTHORISED EDITION*)

IN THE

*SECOND SESSION* OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE SEVENTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

## HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

---

SIXTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS.

*Tuesday, 7th May,* 1907.

### PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Rawtenstall Corporation; North-East London Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

St. Neots Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments.

City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [H.L.].—The Order made on the 25th of April last, appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged.

Bristol Corporation Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read $1^a$, and referred to the Examiners.

Midland Railway Bill [H.L.]; York (Micklegate) Strays Bill (H.L.]; Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Cavehill and Whitewell Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Aberdeen Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Leave given to the Select Committee to adjourn over To-morrow.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.].—Read $2^a$ according to order.

### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3774. United States (Chicago)

No. 3775. Russia (Batoum and District).

No. 3776. Turkey (Constantinople and District).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

### COLLEGE CHARTER ACT, 1871.

Application from the right hon. Reginald McKenna, President of the Board of Education, for the establishment and incorporation of a college of Science and Technology at South Kensington, which has been referred by His Majesty in Council for the consideration and report of a Committee of His Majesty's Most Hon. Privy Council, together with a draft of the Charter applied for: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

---

### DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS BILL [H.L.]

Reported from the Standing Committee without Amendment: and to be read 3ª on Monday next.

---

### HOUSE OF LORDS (REFORM) BILL [H.L.].

Order of the day read for resuming the adjourned debate on the Amendment proposed by the Earl Cawdor to the Motion for the Second Reading, viz.—

> "To leave out all the words after 'that' for the purpose of inserting these words: 'A Select Committee to be appointed to consider the suggestions which have from time to time been made for increasing the efficiency of the House of Lords in matters affecting legislation, and to report as to the desirability of adopting them either in their original or in some modified form.'"

*THE **LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY**: My Lords, I shall not detain your Lordships long from listening to those whom we are all anxious to hear, but it does seem to me on all grounds right that something should be said from the Episcopal Bench in this debate. Owing to a variety of circumstances it is undoubtedly the fact that the Bishops today take a less prominent and constant part in the debates of your Lordships' House than was taken by the Bishops of fifty or 100 years ago. A reference to *Hansard* would make that clear. The main reason—there are several reasons—is the wholly good one of the vast multiplication of diocesan work which necessitates the bishops remaining for the most part in their dioceses.

But as the present constitution of Church and Realm stands the Bishops are vitally concerned in all that affects the House of Lords. Some of your Lordships may have heard comments—I have —upon the fact that in the sentence which prefaces enactments the first reference made is to those who sit upon the Episcopal Bench. The enactment is made by the King—

> "By and with the consent of the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and the Commons."

The reason, I suppose, is that, as a matter of mere history, in the various elements which go to make up this House the Lords spiritual were the earliest to have a certain and an assured place. The facts as to the summoning of lay peers to Parliament have varied from time to time. Not all the lay peers have always been summoned, and the position of the lay peer in early days was less assured than in later times as regards the certainty of a place in the deliberations of this House. From the first Bishops were always summoned. Take the office which I have at present the honour and privilege of holding. However inadequately its duties or responsibilities may be discharged this particular office is, as a matter of fact, the most deeply rooted of any in the origins of Parliamentary history and the participation in Parliamentary action. I mention that simply to show how deeply concerned Bishops must necessarily be in all that affects the constitutional life and the constitutional organisation of the House of Lords.

There is, however, another fact which gives the Bishops a distinctive right to speak on any matter affecting the constitution of the House of Lords. We heard a great deal last night about the need of independence and detachment from mere Party ties. I venture to contend that the Bishops, speaking generally, go far towards satisfying that requirement. Whatever may have been the case in the past, there can now be no question at all that the Bishops are largely independent of direct partisan allegiance. With regard to my twenty-five brothers on the Episcopal Bench, I should find the greatest difficulty in stating to which Party all, but five or six, should be assigned. No doubt there is one great group of questions as to which the Bishops have allied themselves in action mainly with the

Party now in Opposition—questions affecting the religious life of England and the continuance of the arrangements for its security. But in regard to another great group of questions, questions of social reform, it is indisputably the case now, whatever it may have been in the past, that the Bishops, who are not infrequently spoken of outside as an appanage of the Tory Party, more frequently give their votes to the Liberal than to the Conservative Party.

Take my own case simply as a specimen. Other examples would easily be found. —I have looked into the records of the years which preceded the retirement of Lord Salisbury from the office of Prime Minister—a time when there happened to be no great ecclesiastical questions, but many important social questions—and I find that, out of eleven divisions, I voted eight times against Lord Salisbury and, on two out of the three occasions when I voted with the noble Lord, the front Liberal Bench went into the same lobby. I claim no credit or discredit for those votes. I merely urge that so far as they go, they afford evidence that the Episcopal Bench contributes something to that impartiality or balance upon subjects of general controversy which we are told that this House ought to show.

This being so, the question is—What ought to be the attitude of the Bishops in regard to the proposals now before the House? Personally I have a little difficulty in understanding why it was specially opportune that the question of the reform of the House of Lords should be raised just now. I am not averse from the question being raised, and I think great good may follow from the debate. But even if the changes that are foreshadowed in the Bill are such as to bring the House of Lords, in theory, more into touch with national life —a proposition which I am not at this stage prepared either to affirm or deny —I am not clear that any evidence has recently been given of the House being specially out of touch with national life.

References have been made to what took place on the Education Bill last year. I should not be at all sorry to take that Bill as the touchstone to decide this particular question. I believe the action taken by the House of Lords on the Education Bill was in consonance, on the whole, with the opinion of the people of England. If the issue, complex and difficult as it was, could have been submitted to the country we might have been proved to be wrong; but my belief is that in regard to some of the details upon which the Government insisted as vital to the Bill, the mind of the country was with those who resisted the Government rather than with those who supported them. I am speaking, of course, of the details and not of the main groundwork and intention of the Bill. Therefore, I am not clear as to what exactly are the grounds upon which at this moment it can be said there is a special necessity or special opportuneness in raising the question of the reform of the House of Lords. But we have now to decide whether we shall give the Bill forthwith a Second Reading, or whether we shall first send the matter to be weighed and discussed by a Committee of the House. Personally I have no doubt that of those two courses we ought to select the second, and adopt the Amendment of Lord Cawdor. Whatever good items there may be in the Bill of Lord Newton, and I think there are very many, for the Bill is exceedingly clever, ingenious, and, as I think, fair, they are not really ripe for our voting upon them without further examination having first been given in the only way in which adequate examination can rightly be given to such a subject. But, if a Committee is to be formed, it must be a weighty and representative one, really adequate in size and importance, and it must take the matter in hand, not with a view of shelving it, but with a view of trying to arrive at a solution of some of the questions at stake.

That being the question before us, the Government cut across it with another proposition altogether. We are asked to wait until we see the Government's proposals for dealing with the question of differences which may arise between one House and the other. I am most ready to listen to such proposals. I think there is a very real need for the consideration of that subject. I am by no means inclined to make light of the difficulties which have arisen or may arise on that question.

I confess I have the very greatest difficulty in understanding what kind of proposition is likely to meet that particular case, the more so after hearing yesterday's debate. But the point that is clear is that, however important that question is, it has really little or nothing to do with the question before us at this moment.

Let us suppose that there had been no friction in the past and no chance of friction in the future between the two Houses. The occasions of friction have not been very many, but let us suppose that the two Houses always worked together in perfect harmony; it would still be perfectly possible to say that this House, with its long record of antiquity and its somewhat curious manner of growth to its present condition, might require some reconsideration in the various parts that go to make its construction, and that it might be desirable to secure by some changes, even more promptitude, thoroughness, and efficiency in its work than it at present possesses. The two propositions appear to me to be on totally different lines, and not to contradict or overlap one another in any way. But, if the Government think we could better consider the question of our constituent elements as raised by the Bill if the House knew beforehand what they are themselves going to propose in regard to occasions of possible friction between the two Houses, I wonder why we are not now forearmed and strengthened by being told what the proposals are.

The Government's proposals were last night foreshadowed in somewhat vague and general terms, but with obviously a large reserve of detailed knowledge on the part of the two noble Lords who spoke on behalf of the Government, and I find it a little difficult to understand why if those propositions are already prepared your Lordships should not at once be informed what they are. It was very fairly and truly stated last night by my noble friend Lord Crewe that when those propositions were made it would be necessary that the Opposition in the House of Commons should have ample time to consider them. I quite agree, it is obviously necessary. But would they not have a chance of being considered even more adequately if the propositions were laid before us now, and if they were thus open to examination by the public some little time before the discussion in the House of Commons takes place?

I am certainly not averse from the discussion of possible modifications in the construction of the House of Lords. Indeed there are some parts of the noble Lord's Bill to which I for one cordially assent if it be thought desirable that changes should take place. There is, for example, one comparatively small proposal of the noble Lord which affects the Episcopal Bench, which I have read with great interest. Undoubtedly at this moment, owing to the circumstances of the case, the Bishops are in a somewhat peculiar position with regard to the proportion of the members of their body who have a seat in this House. The Bishops are increasing in number as new dioceses are formed, and it is an indisputable difficulty and disadvantage that at present Bishops newly appointed have to wait many years before they obtain a seat in this House, while it might easily happen that one or two senior members of the Bench who find it more difficult to attend the House would be ready, or even glad, that the younger members should take their place. I believe this House, the Church, and the Bishops themselves would gain if some well-considered and reasonable change in that respect were brought about. But that is not to say that, for the sake of effecting a change, one amongst many, which I believe might quite possibly be wholesome, it is clearly necessary now to take the whole matter in hand and, if I may use a disrespectful word, set to work upon a general tinkering of the Constitution.

If the question is brought before us at all, I think it ought first to be considered by a Committee, and if a committee is appointed I hope the weighty words last night of the late Lord Chancellor will be borne in mind, that we are dealing, not with the framing of a new body in a new land, but with an ancient institution which may or may not need reform in some of its details, but which ought at all events to be handled with the utmost reverence, care, and scrupulous regard both to the past history and to the present conditions which attach to the constitutional life of the House of Lords.

There are many things in old structures, whether they be buildings or bodies of men, which probably we would not place in exactly the existing form if we were constructing them anew, but with which the history and life of the country are inwrought, and which we should be very loth to sweep away merely in order to make something fresh and new, and possibly better proportioned. The conditions are analogous to those of the contrast, which I have often felt to be real and significant, between one of our old cities and some new town, say, in the United States or one of the Colonies. For many practical purposes the new town, with its broad, straight, level thoroughfares at right angles is much better suited for such requirements as the rapid progression of tramways, for the provision of central railway stations, and the like; but our old cities, such as Oxford, Winchester, or the City of London itself, with the peculiar angles and twists and turns of their streets, inconvenient in some respects as they may sometimes be, are linked with the English life of the past, and have associations which endear them, indirectly and perhaps half consciously, in the popular regard. The analogy seems to me not an untrue one in considering anomalies which can be discovered in the Constitution of England or of this House, and if a Committee is appointed I trust that the utmost care will be taken, in dealing with the various aspects of the question, to consider not merely the apparent necessities of the passing hour, but the place which we hold in the History and in the life of England.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE: My Lords, as I understand that time this evening is especially valuable I think the House will not desire that I should take up any of its time in commenting upon the weighty and important speech to which we have just listened. I will at once proceed to make those observations which occur to me as necessary upon the position in which we stand at the moment. Before I refer either to the Bill or to the Amendments of which notice has been given, I desire to call the attention of the Government and the House, but especially of the Government, to the difficult and, as I think, unfair position in which this House has been placed by the course which they have adopted. In His Majesty's gracious Speech from the Throne, the first paragraph relating to the business of the session was as follows:—

> "Serious questions affecting the working of our Parliamentary system have arisen from unfortunate differences between the two Houses. My Ministers have this important subject under consideration with a view of a solution of the difficulty."

Reference was made in both Houses of Parliament to this paragraph of the Speech, and it was spoken of in both Houses as the most important question of legislation to be dealt with. It was open to us to infer from those expressions that the proposals which were going to be made by the Government were likely to be of a somewhat drastic character, and I am bound to confess that I heard nothing in the speech of the Lord President of the Council last night which was in any degree inconsistent with that inference.

On the first night of the debate on the Address, the noble Marquess the Leader of this House pleaded for time. He said that the differences between the two Houses which made necessary the consideration of this question by the Government had arisen just previously to Christmas. "What," he asked, "would have been said if the Government had come down in February with a cut and dried scheme?" Well, February has passed, March has passed, April has passed, we are now not far from the middle of May, and now we are told that not until after Whitsuntide—and we do not know how long after the Whitsuntide holidays—shall we know what these proposals of the Government are. My noble friend Lord Crewe regretted this delay, and he attributed it to the state of business in the other House. I venture to doubt whether the state of business in the other House is the only cause of this delay, and whether it may not have been in some degree due to the fact that the Government have not, even after this long interval of time, completely made up their minds to come to the House with a cut and dried scheme.

My noble friend said that when these proposals were submitted to the other House of Parliament, the friends of this House in that House would require time for their consideration. I cannot admit that. These proposals, whatever they may be, do not directly affect the House of Commons, but they will directly and immediately affect this House, and it is due to this House that they should be laid before us at the very earliest opportunity after they have been formulated. We should have no complaint to make if the Government had come down to this House and told us—as they might have told us, probably with truth—that they found this question one of greater difficulty and less urgency than they had supposed at the beginning of the session, and that they had determined to postpone its consideration until another session. But we shall have every reason to complain if the announcement of these proposals is deferred until the fag-end of the session, when, under any circumstances, this House would have scanty time to consider them. We shall have still greater reason to complain if they should be submitted to us concurrently with a number of controversial measures which we shall be called upon to pass under a veiled threat—a scarcely veiled threat—that if differences should arise between us and the other House of Parliament, the Government are prepared with a short and summary way of settling those differences.

The noble Earl the Lord President of the Council has placed upon the Paper a general proposition to the effect that it is inexpedient to consider any proposals for the reform of this House until satisfactory means have been found for adjusting differences which may have arisen between the two Houses of Parliament. But I can find in the speech of my noble friend no word in support of the proposition. In the opinion of my noble friend this is a very good House as it stands, and a House which is able to transact the business which comes before it very well and very efficiently. In his opinion it has only one fatal and incurable defect—a defect which cannot be cured by any conceivable process of reform—namely, that it contains too large a Conservative majority, and that it cannot be relied on to pass without Amendment or without any appeal to the country every measure that may be submitted to it by a Radical House of Commons.

I submit that the question of the reform of the House of Lords and the question of the adjustment of differences between the two Houses of Parliament are distinct and separate questions. I cannot admit that the former could not with advantage be discussed until the other has been disposed of. On the contrary, it is in the highest degree important that if we are about to consider the relations between the two Houses which together compose the Legislature of this country, we ought to have a full knowledge of the existing and proposed constitution of both of those Houses and of the authority which each of them possesses or is capable of possessing. But, by the speech of the Lord President, we are given to clearly understand that the Government intend to have nothing to do with the reform of this House; they have no proposals of their own to make, and they decline to consider proposals which are put forward from any other quarter. We are given clearly to understand that there is nothing which will content them except the unrestricted and uncontrolled legislative supremacy of the House of Commons.

It may be, my Lords, although nothing has yet fallen from the Government which would lend colour to such a supposition, that the proposals of the Government when made to us may involve something of the nature of a *referendum*. If that should be so, I entertain no doubt that such a proposal would meet, I will not say with a favourable, but with a perfectly fair and candid consideration here. Even if that should be so, I can conceive no reasons why the door should be closed to any attempt to carry into effect reforms in this House which might bring it into closer touch with the other House of Parliament and with the people, and so render resort to such an untried and cumbrous constitutional innovation less necessary or less frequent.

I am not going to inflict upon the House any constitutional essay, nor am I going to try to describe what in my view might be a more satisfactory or an ideal Second Chamber, but I wish in a very few words to indicate what are the elements of strength and of weakness that exist in the present constitution of this House. It is admitted that, in consequence of the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, this House contains a large number of men of administrative ability and experience, through the inclusion within its walls of men who have rendered good service to the State in civil, military, and judicial capacities at home, abroad, and in the Colonies. The presence of such men cannot but be an advantage to the deliberations of any legislative Assembly.

It is admitted that the House of Lords is not an unpopular institution in the country. The number of Members of your Lordships' House who have previously been Members of the House of Commons is a proof that close connexion with this House is no bar to the confidence and support of numerous constituencies. On the other hand it is, I think, generally admitted now that the almost exclusively hereditary basis upon which this House rests, the absence from it of any representative character, its too close connexion with and over-representation of the landed interest, its comparative dissociation from certain interests, such as industry, commerce, and labour, and the consequent predominance within this House of one political Party, its unwieldy size, involving the occasional attendance of a large number of Peers who take no habitual part in its proceedings, and many of whom may be unfit to do so—it is admitted that these are elements of weakness. I think it must also be admitted that they are elements which tend in themselves to produce that incompatibility of temper between the two Houses which leads to differences, and makes those differences difficult of adjustment.

All these elements of strength and weakness have been more or less recognised by my noble friend Lord Newton in the Bill before your Lordships. But the discussion which has taken place has shown that the concrete proposals contained in that measure have not yet been sufficiently examined to secure for them general acceptance on the part of a very large number of Members of this House. I agree with my noble friend Lord Cawdor that it would be unwise, by giving a Second Reading of this Bill, to commit ourselves at the present time to the acceptance of many of the principles which it contains. I agree with him in thinking that it may be a preferable course to refer these and any other proposals that may be made to the consideration of a Committee such as that which was suggested, unfortunately without result, many years ago by my noble friend on the Cross Benches, Lord Rosebery. I shall therefore vote for the appointment of the Committee suggested by my noble friend, Lord Cawdor, and afterwards I hope to give a vote—which I shall give with far greater satisfaction—against the dilatory Amendment which has been suggested by the Government.

If urgency exists for finding some means of adjusting differences between the two Houses, it has arisen solely from the events which have taken place within the existence of the present Parliament. I am far from saying that a case may not be made out for endeavouring to find some improved machinery by which differences when they arise may be more easily adjusted. But if this necessity exists it is a new necessity. Up to the date of the present Parliament means of settling differences between the two Houses have always been found. The course of progress and of reform has never been permanently obstructed by the action of this House. This House has never permanently thwarted the clearly expressed will of the country, even in matters in which it held distinctly different convictions and opinions. Instances are not wanting in which experience has shown that this House has been a more faithful and more accurate exponent of the real will of the people than the House of Commons. Take the case of the last reform of the House of Commons. It is true that this House delayed the passing of the Franchise Bill; but it delayed it only for one session, and almost simultaneously with the passing of the Franchise Bill in the next session a Redistribution Bill was passed, to the great satisfaction even of the House of Commons and the great satisfaction of the country.

I am not surprised that not much reference has been made by speakers on the Government side of the House to the history of the Home Rule Bill. I hope that this House and the country will not forget that history. No more striking and conclusive proof of the advantage and necessity of a Second Chamber—even an unreformed Second Chamber—has ever been given than that afforded by the history of that measure. If that measure had been passed it could never have been repealed except through the stress of something approaching to revolution or civil war. But for the action of the House of Lords that measure would have been passed; and it would have been passed, as the result has proved, against the will of the country. The Government are again raising the question of Irish Government, but I shall be very much surprised to find that even this Government or this House of Commons proposes to reintroduce either the Home Rule Bill of 1886 or that of 1893.

The action of this House in the case of the Act for the disestablishment of the Irish Church was a proof that it did not hesitate to defer to the clearly expressed will of the people, even when that will was decidedly opposed to their own strong convictions. I desire to call attention to the canon which was laid down in the most weighty and authoritative words by the late Lord Salisbury in the debate upon that measure, a canon which I believe this House not only acted upon then, but has been prepared and is still prepared to act upon on any similar occasion. Lord Salisbury said—

> "Again, there is a class of cases, small in number, varying in kind, in which the nation must be called into counsel and must decide the policy of the Government. We must decide by all we see around us, and by the events that are passing. We must decide, each for himself, upon our conscience and to the best of our judgment, in the exercise of that tremendous responsibility which at such a time each Member of this House bears, whether the House of Commons does or does not represent the full, deliberate, and sustained convictions of the body of the nation. But when we once have come to the conclusion, from all the circumstances of the case, that the House of Commons is at one with the nation, it appears to me—save in some very exceptional cases, save in the highest cases of morality, in those cases in which a man would not set his hand to a proposition though a revolution should follow his refusal—it appears to me that the occasion for the action of this House has passed away, that it must devolve responsibility upon the nation, and may fairly accept the conclusion at which the nation has arrived."

*The Duke of Devonshire.*

So long as this House accepts that canon for its conduct I do not believe it can go far wrong. Cases may arise in which it makes mistakes in forming its view as to the true opinion of the people. It may from time to time interpose delays in necessary legislation; it may cause friction irritating to the Party which may be in power, but it will never permanently obstruct the settled will of the nation, and it will never permanently obstruct legislative reforms clearly and evidently desired by the people, even if in some cases those reforms may be, in its opinion, unwise.

My Lords, that is the extent of the claim made by this House. This House has never claimed, and it does not now claim, to act upon its own convictions in defiance of the opinions either of the House of Commons or of the nation. So long as this House remains an integral part of the Legislature of this country I trust that it will so remain in fact, as well as in name, and that it will continue to discharge those duties which are the true functions of any Second Chamber, and will use its judgment, where the gravity of the case requires it, to secure that the will, the true will, of the people should be ascertained, and, when it is ascertained, that it should be acted upon.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: My Lords, I can truly say that when I contemplated this debate, and almost throughout its course last night, I had no intention of adding to the intolerably long speeches which at various times I have addressed to your Lordships on this subject. But the very genial and kindly references made in the course of the debate last night to my former action in this matter made it appear to me, on reflection, unseemly to give a silent vote, and therefore I am anxious to explain the grounds of my action this evening. I speak as a Member unencumbered by the responsibilities of either front bench; I speak entirely as one who has addressed himself in former days to this subject, and as one who has spent some forty years more or less in this Chamber, without having had any option of being a member of any other.

Now, we have three propositions before us, because I regard the proposal of Lord

Heneage as depending on that of Lord Newton, and therefore I class them as one. And so I take, in the first place, the Bill of Lord Newton. I do not think we can express in words our indebtedness to my noble friend for bringing this subject forward. If this Bill had no other operation it has at least furnished an interesting and suggestive text for a debate not unworthy of the traditions of this House, and in itself I think it contains many valuable suggestions not, as the noble Lord himself admits, entirely original, but furnishing a compact code for the House of Lords reformer, which he may carry in his pocket, if he may not carry it elsewhere.

I am sorry, therefore, that I am unable to vote for the Bill. My reason for that is exceedingly simple, and though some noble Lords have spoken very freely of their intention not to vote for the Bill I do not think they have given the reason which I must allege for refraining from doing so. My view is this, that, under present circumstances, a Bill of this kind is not a practical measure. Who can look at the present structure and condition of the House of Commons and believe for one moment that even if the Bill were passed unanimously by this House —of which, I may say, I do not see the slightest prospect—it would stand the least chance of securing even a First Reading in the other House of Parliament? I do not believe it would get beyond the Bar of the other House. I am not at all sure that it would get through the central lobby, such are the feelings by which the majority in the House of Commons are animated towards this highly respectable Assembly. And therefore I do not think that it comports with the dignity of this House to address itself seriously to a measure which deals so largely with its internal constitution and conditions, only to send it down the lobby to be kicked out and treated with contempt by the other House of Parliament. That, I think, is a complete and sufficient reason, whether we agree with the provisions of the Bill or not, for not voting for the Second Reading on this occasion. It will, I take it, be one of the documents which will be put before the Select Committee which has been moved for by my noble friend Lord Cawdor, and therefore it will receive the same examination that it would receive from the Committee of Lord Heneage. To pass the Second Reading, to continue the discussion upon this Bill, to carry it in a practical form and send it down a concrete Bill, approved by this House, to be treated with contumely by the other House of Parliament, is not a course, I confess, to recommend itself to me.

Now, I come to the proposition of my noble friend Lord Cawdor, which I view with a gloomy satisfaction. I view it with satisfaction because I have myself twice endeavoured to bring forward a similar proposition before your Lordships, and on each occasion I was defeated by no less than two to one. On the first occasion I received the resounding rebukes of both front benches. My own leaders chastened me with no unsparing hand, and I need hardly say that from the Conservative benches the buffets were not unequal to those of the Liberal front bench. On the second occasion I did succeed in obtaining the somewhat reluctant support of my own leaders, but I again encountered the stern and unbending resistance of Lord Salisbury, whose name we all remember with respect in this House. It is therefore with extreme satisfaction that I read on the Notice Paper the Motion of my noble friend, and feel confident that under these better auspices the Motion of which I first dreamed twenty-three years ago will at last be carried safely into port.

I said a gloomy satisfaction. My gloom does not arise from any jealousy of the success of my noble friend as compared with that of my own futile efforts. That was not in my mind. My gloom arises from another circumstance. In the year 1888, when I urged this question upon your Lordships, I devoted the greatest part of my speech to urge upon you the question of opportunity. I begged of you then, when a Conservative Government was predominant and all-powerful in both Houses of Parliament, not to neglect that opportunity which might not occur again. I was wrong; it did occur again. It occurred in the ten years of Government which lasted from 1895 to 1905. Those two golden opportunities have been lost. I do not know that they will ever return. But

I hope, without desiring too ardently the success at the polls of my noble friends behind me (the Opposition) that an opportunity will recur, and that they will avail themselves of it if there be still time to reform what are, at any rate, the somewhat glaring anomalies of this House.

Now I come to the third proposition on the Paper, to which, though it was moved by a distinguished relative of my own, I confess I am not able to give any more cordial benediction than it has received from other quarters. It would have given me unbounded satisfaction to pour the humble ointment of my praise over him, and to say that his Amendment both satisfied my logical sense and was congenial to my own opinions. But I confess the more I think of it the more it seems to me that that Motion has nothing whatever to do with the Resolutions which were moved from this side of the House. What have the relations of the two Houses to do with a question of strictly internal reform? I want you to consider for a moment the analogy of the other House. The House of Commons has passed in the last eighty years three great Reform Bills, all for the purpose of broadening the basis upon which it rests, and so immeasurably increasing its own power. Suppose on each one of those occasions the House of Lords had demurred from even considering that project of reform until the relations between the two Houses had been adjusted. I should like to know what would have been the treatment accorded to that demand by the House of Commons.

We had already a difficult position to maintain in dealing with those Bills as it was, but if the proposition of my noble friend the Lord President is correct, then the case for making that demand to the House of Commons is infinitely stronger than the demand of the House of Commons (which, after all, is that voiced by my noble friends opposite), to have our internal reform postponed to the adjustment of our relations. Why? You might have said to the House of Commons, "You go on increasing your own power by this Bill, you are adding strength to strength, you are completely overshadowing us, you have entirely deranged the balance which was intended by the Constitution to be established between the two Houses; what compensation do you propose to give us for that? In what way do you mean to adjust the relations between the two Houses, so that they may remain as they were originally intended to be by the Constitution?" That would have been a legitimate demand. But now, after centuries in which the House of Lords has existed—and existed, in my opinion, to its own detriment—without any tangible effort of reform, when it does pluck up its energies and resolve upon appointing a Committee for inquiring into the best means of making itself more efficient, down comes the Government, and at its back the House of Commons, and says, "No, we shall do nothing of the kind; we place you under an exhaust receiver until we are inclined to take other measures."

The metaphor has often been used, and not unfairly used, in this discussion that we are engaged in an ill-assorted marriage with the other House of Parliament. Let me work that metaphor out in connection with this subject for a moment. We are engaged in a singularly ill-assorted marriage with the House of Commons at this moment. Sometimes it happens that, when a Conservative Government is in, the relations between the couple are more as they should be. But suppose, taking that metaphor to be the fact, a husband were to say to a wife, or whichever the predominant partner of the marriage is—and I am not prepared to dogmatise on that subject—supposing the predominant partner were to say to the weaker partner—and no one denies in this House that the House of Commons is infinitely the predominant partner, if only from its power of the purse—supposing the predominant partner were to say to the weaker partner, "I must tell you frankly that I observe your endeavour to amend your ways with the greatest dissatisfaction. I am promoting a divorce suit against you"—not improbably in an American Court—"and it does not answer my purpose that you should amend your conduct so as to impede my course and to make the court less inclined to decide in my favour." Would not the weaker partner be justified in replying, "You are at perfect liberty, as you like, to endeavour to adjust our relations to your own special wishes, but for heaven's sake do not prevent me adjusting myself!" I honestly think that this is a fair definition of what the Government's position is in regard to this matter.

I think we have some right to complain that this ancient House, with it roots deep down in the past history of England, roots which, I do not think, are immediately likely to be wrenched up, is not to be afforded any opportunity of reconsidering its own constitution until the Government in its wisdom, before or after the Whitsuntide holidays, or some time in August or during an autumn session, whenever it may suit their purpose best, shall think fit to declare their intentions with regard to us. I hope my noble friends opposite will not object to my saying that their course in reference to this House has not been wholly free from ambiguity. It may remind some political humourist of the immortal course taken by Mr. Snodgrass on a famous occasion—

> "Mr. Snodgrass, in a truly Christian spirit"

—I wish to give you the exact words, not my own imperfect recollection—

> "and in order that he might take no one unawares, announced in a very loud voice that he was going to begin, and proceeded to take off his coat with the utmost deliberation."

It was on 20th or 21st December that the Prime Minister, in a speech of which I have no reason to complain, because I think it extremely probable that in his position in the House of Commons I should have wished to make the same speech myself, said—

> "The resources of the British Constitution are not wholly exhausted, the resources of the House of Commons are not exhausted, and I say, with conviction, that a way must be found, a way will be found, by which the will of the people expressed through their elected representatives in this House will be made to prevail."

"A way will be found," says the Prime Minister, but months have passed over us and bleached our heads without any announcement being made. The way that has been found has been a subterranean way so far; I hope it will not prove to be a mine. But, at any rate, it is not, perhaps, an adequate or satisfactory way of dealing with a great constitutional question. It has been followed by warm speeches which usually announced, in their perorations, that, though the House of Lords was a detestable thing in itself, yet there was such complete confidence in the energy of the Prime Minister and the plan that he had in his pocket that there would be no difficulty in dealing with it when the time came. This complete confidence in the Prime Minister has now subsided into complete silence and a constant series of inadequate postponements. I myself, and I think many of your Lordships, have expected almost daily since the session began to see the Prime Minister marching to the bar of this House like a second Cromwell, followed by such civic and municipal attendants as he thought it right to engage, and, walking up to this table, saying, in the old spirit, "Enough of this foolery" and bundling away the mace under his arm like an umbrella. As a matter of fact, we have had no such appearance, no such historical scene, no such advantage as that. We have only had the concrete plan of a well-known and eminent journalist which has received its meed of discussion in a leading article in *The Times* and is, I trust, not unworthy of a mention within the walls of this House. The plan propounded was this—I think *The Times* discussed it seriously or I should not have thought of mentioning it—that the existing Members of the House of Lords, those who wished to continue to sit here, should each pay £400 a year, which should be devoted to finding satisfactory stipends of £300 to the other House of Parliament. That was the plan, which, I believe, is to be submitted to The Hague Conference. That would indeed have been a glaring and glowing exemplification of the old expression, "Robbing Peter to pay Paul." There would have been two Houses—the House of Peter and the House of Paul. The House of Peter would have been the contributory slave to the House of Paul. How long the funds would have been found adequate, how long the gentlemen who were prepared to pay £400 a year for doing nothing here and licking the feet of their oppressor would have lasted, I myself am not in a position to state; but I rather think that, if the stipends of the House of Commons had depended on the £400 a year raised from surviving Members of this House, they would have had a very meagre salary indeed.

I am sorry to say that the Government, not having adopted this plan, which promised such commercial advantages to the other House, are beginning to be suspected of a somewhat more insidious and sinister strategy. There is a gradual suspicion growing up—I am sorry to say it has long lurked in the guilty recesses of my own mind—that the constant series of measures of a somewhat drastic character affecting property which are almost daily promised by the Government, and which, in view of the legislative embarrassment in the other House, constitute somewhat of a puzzle to their own supporters, are not intended so much for the benefit of agriculture or of society as a whole as for the purpose of what I may call "snowballing" your Lordships' House. The calculation appears to be that if enough of these measures are introduced and flung at the head of this House, even though it may not be possible to carry them out to a legislative conclusion, at last the victim, faint and damp and shuddering, may be induced to succumb.

When we look at the record of the Government's legislation on land we shall see that they are not wholly free from suspicion on this account. Last year English land engaged their attention. How did they deal with it? I remember very well the way in which my old master, Mr. Gladstone, dealt with questions like this—the exhaustive, painful, conscientious inquiry with which he embarked on those measures, some of which your Lordships did not approve, but which at anyrate bore the marks of laborious and conscientious investigation. That is not the course of my noble friends opposite. Something had to be done, so they picked up by the wayside the derelict Bill of a private Member—so private, indeed, that, to my great regret, he has altogether ceased to be a Member of Parliament—and brought it under the consideration of Parliament with the greatest pride, as of a hen which has laid an unusually large egg, as the product of their own unaided ability. In some mysterious recess of Parliament, I think it was in Grand Committee, this Bill, which was wholly unsuited and without any relation to the Scottish system of agriculture, was extended to Scotland, and there you had a British Land Bill passed by the Government in its first session.

*The Earl of Rosebery.*

But that has not at all satiated their energies. Land is now to be dealt with in the second session in both countries again, without, so far as I know, any greater inquiry, any further investigation, or the slightest evidence of any requirement for it. In Scotland there is a great but silent enthusiasm, which has communicated itself only to the Prime Minister and the Lord Advocate, for a measure which shall extend the most disastrous form of agriculture known to mankind, the Highland crofting system, to the prosperous regions of the Lowlands. I do not say that that is altogether without support. I study the Scottish Press, and I find one constant and unvarying source of support, and only one. It is that which comes from those particular Socialists who are called the "single taxers," who write ingenious letters in support of this measure in the western papers and sign themselves "Single Tax." I do not say these measures may not be very good when they have been sufficiently revised, but I only point out that the constant series of introductions of these measures, which never seem to go much further in their legislative progress—and, after all, we are near Whitsuntide and little has been done—are evidence that the Government is rather disposed to what I may call "snowballing" the House of Lords by measures of this kind than of attacking it in face and in front. I do not altogether blame the Government for this course, because I know myself from bitter experience the difficulty of dealing with the House of Lords. In 1895 I was extremely anxious to appeal to the country on the subject of the House of Lords, but none of my then colleagues were willing to address a similar appeal, and so it came to nothing. And all appeals of that kind must necessarily come to nothing unless you can stir the country sufficiently in your favour to make that movement irresistible.

There is one point in this matter not hitherto alluded to in course of debate; it is this—that whatever the measures contemplated by the Government may be, however drastic, however radical they may be, they cannot be carried into effect without the consent of this House—except by a revolution. I, in my own humble efforts at reforming this House, never disguised this fact for a moment, that you cannot constitutionally override the will of this House except by a revolution. There was a revolution—a suppressed revolution—in 1832; the House of Lords was wise, and averted it; but you cannot, without a revolution, however peaceful, however bloodless it may be, overcome the resistance of this House constitutionally by the act of the other House merely. This point is, I suppose, familiar to my noble friends, and I hope they will bear it in mind in bringing forward their proposals for the revision of the relations between the two Houses. You cannot do this unaided; they must have the consent of this House; they must be able to stir up a feeling in the country to override the prejudices and the resistance of this House. It is for that purpose, I think, these various measures have been brought before Parliament. Beyond that point we are not particularly concerned to-night with the policy of His Majesty's Government; they have no suggestions to make in this debate except that it is ill-timed, and that they have something to put forward at a later period.

I am anxious, passing from that aspect of the case, to say a few words as to the deliberate conclusions I have arrived at in this matter after a longer study of this question, perhaps, than many noble Lords have been able to give to it. These conclusions are three, and I regard them as fundamental in the consideration of this question. The first consideration, I am afraid, will not recommend itself to the noble and learned Earl behind me, whom, I think, we heard with so much pleasure last night in full vigour, and in the echoes of whose voice I seem to think lingered a conviction that he was the last of the real Tories; and a real Tory, an honest Tory, and a Tory who is not afraid to speak his mind will always be a highly respectable character in any Assembly. But I am sorry to say I do not believe with him in the perfection of this House, and am constrained to think that its mainly hereditary constitution, however well it may work in practice—of that I say nothing—is wholly impossible logically to be defended.

Again, as the noble Duke in his weighty speech has pointed out, the constitution of this House, owing to its great hold on property, and especially on land, has made it distinctly a Conservative Assembly. The noble and learned Earl last night, I remember, quoted with approval the axiom of John Bright that if you want to change the majority you must try and convince it into Liberalism. Well, I wish my noble friends opposite long life and all the prosperity that long life may give them as Ministers and men, but I do not in my wildest aspirations look forward to the day when they as live men will convince the House of Lords to Liberal opinions and bring a majority to that side of the House. I am afraid that if ever that should happen they will be like the Struldbrugs in Gulliver's Travels, doomed to lead a not altogether happy, but immortal existence.

The next proposition which I put forward is perhaps more congenial to noble Lords behind me, it is this—that the country, the thinking part of the country, would prefer a House of Lords unreformed to no Second Chamber at all. I think no one who has watched the course of a general election, which turns so often on temporary or even trivial matters, would wish to see a great majority in the House of Commons the sole disposer of the liberties and conditions of life of the nation. I will take two cases, telling against each side, and I cannot be more impartial. There was the case of the election of 1900, which was certainly carried out on the question of giving the then Government the strength to carry the war to a successful ending, and if ever there was a clear mandate it was that. It was afterwards utilised, as all Governments have, I suppose, utilised elections, for purposes widely different from that which inspired the election. Again, at the last election, as my noble relative, I think, said last night, the result was due to three causes—one the cry about Chinese slavery, another free trade, and another the education question. Well, there can be no doubt that my noble friends opposite will extend their mandate considerably beyond these matters and would be faulty if they did not; but no one can say that the will of the nation was only consulted as to these special subjects at the general election, and that the representation of the country would be complete if there were no Second Chamber to check a majority so far as it can. I believe, then, that this House is better than no second Chamber at all, though I should like to see very considerable ameliorations in it.

I am sorry to say my third conviction is, perhaps, more painful to the self-love of the Liberal Party than either of the others preceding it. I am convinced by long experience that there can be no reform of this House except with a Conservative Government in power. The Liberal Party do not for obvious reasons wish to reform the House; I always found that my greatest enemies to that reform—I am not speaking of those in this House—were my Liberal friends in the House of Commons. They feared any reform which would strengthen this House; that was the last thing they wished, and that is natural in view of the permanent constitution of this House. Well then, a Tory Government, or a Conservative Government, is the only Government that can carry through a reform of this House—but will it? Is it in human nature for a Conservative Government to do so? When they are in power, what is more convenient to them than the constitution of this House? Surely it is perfectly obvious, however high you may raise the political standard of duty, a Conservative Government, when it comes in, will find more pressing, more urgent questions to deal with than this problem, which in any hands must be a difficult and thorny one.

But, my Lords, is there not a third party to this question beside the two great Parties in the State? It seems to me that there is a part of the nation which has a right to some consideration at the hands of both Parties, and of your Lordships as well; I mean that thinking part of the nation who do not care to concern themselves very much with Party politics, but take a deep interest in the stability of our institutions. I cannot doubt that the thinking part of the nation desires a Second Chamber, more efficient and more logically defensible than this, more elastic, more judicial, less partisan. I said more elastic, perhaps I should say more sympathetic. This House does not seem to me, and it has not seemed to impartial observers, to be sufficiently susceptible to influences from the nation itself. There was one speaker last night, I will not name him at hazard, for I might make a mistake, who put this immobility of the House of Lords as a special virtue and seemed to think that the more it resembled Stonehenge, a circle of stones immovable in character, impervious to changes of time and surroundings, the better the House of Lords would be. I cannot concur in that view of the House. I think of what happened recently. A great wave of feeling swept over the country—I am not going into the causes that brought this about—a great wave of feeling swept away the then Conservative majority in the House of Commons, and substituted an enormous majority of the other Party in its place, but that wave of feeling left this House absolutely unchanged, unmoved. Some few Peers were, no doubt, by the prerogative of the Crown introduced, but one swallow does not make a summer, or even a few. It takes a long time for a new Peer to become acclimatised to this House, and I cannot honestly think that the presence of the new Members of the House has very largely leavened it in the direction of popular demand.

When I say that the thinking part of the country would like something more judicial and less partisan, I think I express what is in the minds of many Members of your Lordships' House, even of those sitting on this side; they would desire to see a more judicial attitude towards large questions than is to be found in this House. It is a matter not of authoritity, it is almost a truism, that the House of Lords hibernates when a Conservative Government is in, and only wakens to life and action when Liberals come into office. That cannot be a safe constitution for this House. It cannot be one upon which you can firmly base a properly constituted Second Chamber. Of course, I know it will be said if a Liberal majority formed the permanent majority in this House we should hear no complaint from Liberals. That is perfectly true. I am perfectly certain that if my noble friends had behind them a party of 400 Peers they would not attempt to reform this House, or re-adjust its relations with the other House. But then we should have the same complaint from the Conservative side. They would not be satisfied with the framework of this House, and we should be no better than we are at present. The inference I draw from what I have said is this—that if it be true that in either case there would be complaint of the Party character of this House, we should endeavour to keep out as far as possible the Party element from this high discussion with regard to our constitution and our future. It has been, I think, on the whole conspicuously absent from this debate. There has been more freedom of vision on all sides of the House than I ever remember in a discussion of this kind. Surely, it is not too much to hope, after the discussion we have had, that the House will lift itself higher than the level of Party, to a purer atmosphere, freer from prejudice, but not altogether aloof from the views of common men upon this earth, and devote themselves to this question without political bias, and with a sole regard to what is due to the nation, to the Constitution, and to the venerable Assembly in which they sit.

*LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: My Lords, I feel that in rising to address your Lordships for a few moments at this point I am at a great disadvantage. I cannot hope to produce anything analogous to the wit and the felicity of language of the noble Earl who has just addressed you. What I have to say will be in unstudied and dull periods. I am one of those who have been described by the noble Earl as not sufficiently acclimatised to this Assembly. But I crave your Lordships' attention for a few moments while I follow up the speech of the noble Earl, with many of whose arguments I am in agreement, by questioning its practical wisdom.

What was really the conclusion to which the noble Earl arrived? It was that the reform of this House is most desirable in its own interest, that a Second Chamber is most desirable in the interest of the nation, but that reform can only be effected under a Conservative Government, and that a Conservative Government would never undertake the duty. In other words, we are landed by the noble Earl in a position of complete impotence. Faults and defects are confessed, but we live in such a charmed circle that forces which could operate for good in removing them will not operate, and those who desire to effect some change are powerless for the purpose.

The first practical question before your Lordships this evening is the comparatively narrow one, whether or not we should give the Bill before the House a Second Reading. For my part I shall support the Second Reading of the Bill, because it will go some way, though a little way, towards a reform of this Chamber. The late Matthew Arnold once said of this Assembly—

> "The House of Lords takes up subjects too late, and when it takes them up it takes them up too feebly."

If your Lordships send the question to a Committee instead of reading the Bill the second time you will be expressing the opinion that the subject is one to talk about, and not one to act upon. The defects pointed out by the noble Earl, and by the noble Duke in his eloquent speech, which expose this House to prejudice, which tend to diminish its authority, which make it an object of vulgar and ignorant talk, those very defects you are making permanent by refusing to take a step which may, at least, be one towards amending them. The noble Earl who has just sat down presented to the outer world the spectacle of a man who admits that something should be done, but thinks that nothing can be done with the machinery in hand; and he proceeded to raise a new prejudice —I was greatly astonished at his action —against this House by picturing your Lordships as trembling almost with anxiety at the prospect of the sort of legislation which will be sent to you by the present Government.

I agree with Lord Rosebery, and with other noble Lords who have addressed us, that there is nothing in the suggestion that the relations between the two Houses require reconsideration which should at all interfere with our undertaking now the question of reforming this House. If you improve the character of this House by removing the defects which excite outside criticism, by dropping out Peers who ordinarily take no interest in the business of this House, by restricting its numbers so as to render them manageable—if in this way you improve the constitution of this House you largely assist in the improvement of the relations between the two Houses. I deprecate the statement made by the noble Duke that what is intended is to give an uncontrolled and unrestricted authority to the House of Commons. I believe the majority of the House of Commons do not desire that; the nation does not desire it, and I am quite sure that His Majesty's Government are not going to make any proposition of that kind. We have the famous dictum of Lord Salisbury, that this House does not defer to the other House because a large majority in that House votes on a particular question, but defers to the predominant sense of the people; and it may be that in that way we may find a solution. In my view, as I have said, there is a danger of making permanent the attacks upon the House which have been denounced as vulgar by refusing to take a step which, small though it is, will at least be a step towards amendment. Because I wish the House to remain as a Second Chamber, because I wish its authority to be higher, and because I wish to clear it of the prejudice which now attaches to it, I shall go readily into the lobby to vote for the Second Reading of the Bill.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I know there are reasons for which it is desirable that this discussion should not be too much prolonged, and I shall not long stand between your Lordships and the division. I should have risen, if for no other reason, because I desire to express the great pleasure with which we listened to the speech delivered by my noble friend on the Cross Benches, and our satisfaction that he should have determined, as he put it himself, not to give a silent vote on this important question, which he has made so much his own.

I did not observe that some passages of his speech were received with equal rapture upon the other side of the House. They must, at any rate, have dispelled from the mind of the Lord President of the Council the idea which he expressed last night, that there was some unreality about this debate. I do not think I have ever listened to a debate in this House of which the complaint that it was unreal could less be made. There was certainly no sign that the feelings of profound alarm with which some of my noble friends regard any attempt to deal with the constitution of this House were simulated feelings nor was there any trace of insincerity in the proposals laid before us by my noble friend Lord Newton and those who think with him, and who so earnestly desire that some effort should be made to add to the efficiency of this House and to increase its hold upon the confidence of the country.

We have been told that this discussion is in some respects inopportune. I do not share that feeling. I know that some of us may think, considering the violence of the manner in which this House has lately been denounced, that there is something undignified in our taking up the question of House of Lords reform at such a moment. I trust your Lordships will not be deterred by any feeling of that kind from taking up this question and considering it, if you think it one you really ought to take up.

Then it is suggested to us that we ought to await the production of the Government scheme. How long are we to wait for the production of the Government scheme? The proposals of His Majesty's Government are proposals *semper cedentia retro.* I do not wish to travel over the ground dealt with by my noble friend on the Cross Benches or to remind your Lordships of the prominence given to this subject in the gracious Speech from the Throne, or of the repeated postponement of the important announcement which we were led to expect. What reason is there for which we should await the production of the Government scheme? We do not know what that scheme is, but we know what it is not. We know that it is not a proposal which overlaps the proposals of Lord Newton. That has been made abundantly clear. The proposal of my noble friend is one designed to increase the efficiency of your Lordships' House; the colleagues of the noble Marquess opposite have made the public well aware that it is very far indeed from their intention to do anything of the kind.

At one time I made a collection of those interesting *obiter dicta*, but they became so numerous that I abandoned the attempt to keep it up to date. But I do remember one of them very distinctly. The speech was made by Mr. Harcourt and he told his hearers that what concerned the Government was that this House should be rendered ' inoperative.'' That was the word used, so that the Government are really pledged to this—that they will not only not increase the efficiency of this House, but they will do what they can to make it inefficient.

My feelings of alarm were certainly not diminished when I listened to the speech of the Lord President of the Council. I thought that the words in which he endeavoured to reassure us were very ominous words. He told us that we should find that the Government proposals still left the House of Lords with a wide field of usefulness, and either he or the First Lord of the Admiralty explained that that usefulness was to be found in the task of assisting the House of Commons. I am afraid, to use a simile suggested by the topics of the day, that your Lordships will find that this wide field of usefulness on closer inspection proves to be a very small holding indeed.

In my view the moment is not an inopportune one for discussing these questions. I agree with the noble Earl on the Cross Benches that what we have to bear in mind is the manner in which this important question is regarded by the thinking part of the people of this country, and I believe that that thinking part of the people are at this moment very largely occupied with the problem of the position of this House, and I for one am glad that we should endeavour to make our contribution to the solution of that problem. It is satisfactory to know that there is a very large amount of general agreement as to the lines upon which a reform of this kind should be dealt with. I believe that there is virtually no difference of opinion as to the necessity of a Second Chamber. I doubt whether on any platform in this country, you would be able to maintain the thesis that in this country of all countries we could do without a Second Chamber. We sometimes refer to the precedents afforded by other countries, but I go so far as to say that if there were no question of precedent, that if this country stood entirely alone, it would be necessary for us to have a Second Chamber, and an efficient Second Chamber. I say that for this reason, that I believe there is no other country in which things are left so absolutely and entirely at the mercy of the chance majority of the day.

It is not only that the Statute-book is left at the mercy of that majority, but the very Constitution of the country is left at their mercy also. There is literally no limit to the extent to which what the late Lord Salisbury called the prerogative of destruction can be exercised by the majority of the day, and I am strongly under the impression that the danger is one which, far from diminishing, increases with every year that passes. One of our great safeguards against rash and ill-considered action used to be found in that privilege of free discussion upon which Englishmen so greatly pride themselves, but with every session of Parliament the limits of free discussion become narrower and narrower. I am not here to say that the guillotine and the closure, both of them by the way not English words, may not be necessary, but I state the fact, and I contend that the frequent use of those two terrible weapons renders it more necessary than it ever was before that there should be some check upon the omnipotence of the elected House of Parliament.

Another practical safeguard is tending to disappear—I mean the control exercised by the Minister over the legislative programme of the session. What do we see? The noble Earl on the Cross Benches has described to you the manner in which during the last few months measures of the utmost importance have been taken up heedlessly on the spur of the moment, by the Government of the day, in spite of the fact that they were not in the Government programme, and could not under any possible circumstances have received the previous examination which they demanded. And so it comes to pass that the majority of the day, consisting, as it must often consist, largely of men entirely untrained to Parliamentary life, has at its foot the whole of the institutions of this country. I therefore assume, as I believe anyone may safely assume, that what the people of this country desire is that we should have a Second Chamber, and that it should be as efficient as possible for the work that is assigned to it under the Constitution.

Now, what is that work? Here, again, is it not fair to say that there is a very general agreement? None of us claim that this House should have the power of permanently obstructing the will of the people of this country; we claim for it that it should have the fullest opportunity of revising and examining the legislation which comes to it, the fullest opportunity of ensuring that the opinion of the country has not been misrepresented. We want a House of Lords which shall stand between the country and a rash and ill-considered decision, and which shall in doing so have behind it in full measure the confidence of the people of this country.

It is from that point of view that we ask ourselves whether the present constitution of this House is or is not capable of improvement. I am one of those who think with Lord Newton that there is room for improvement, and that it is our duty, at any rate, to investigate this question with an open mind, to see whether it is not possible to do something to increase the efficiency of this House, to give it a more representative character, and to secure for it an even larger measure of public confidence than that which it at present obtains. I say that not because I believe that the country desires to see radical changes made in the constitution of the House; certainly not because I believe that your Lordships have any reason for repenting of the manner in which you have lately dealt with measures coming from the other House of Parliament; but because I do believe it should not be beyond our power to deal effectively with some of what I cannot help regarding as the imperfections of our present system.

We have been told by speakers on the Government Bench that the great defect of this House is that it tends to become an appanage, as it is called, of the Conservative Party. When that complaint is made I ask myself what is the ideal Second Chamber which the Lord President of the Council has in his mind. Does he think that it would be possible to invent a Second Chamber which would always be in harmony with the Government of the day, no matter what Party may be in power? Or does he think that by any conceivable means you might have a House of Lords which should be Liberal when the Government is Conservative and Conservative when the Government is Liberal? It passes the wit of man to conceive that any such arrangement should be possible. Then what is it which the noble Earl and those who make this complaint mean when they bring that charge against this House? Is it not simply this—that the House of Lords is sometimes not able to see eye to eye with the Government when the Government is a Liberal Government?

I believe it, however, to be historically incorrect to say that this House has constantly stood in the way of legislation desired by a Liberal majority in the House of Commons. To establish that you have only to look at the legislative achievements, let us say, of the year 1906. His Majesty was advised to take credit for the long list of measures which passed through Parliament last session. Do your Lordships imagine that those were measures which would have been introduced and passed if a Conservative Government had been in power? A great many were measures which did not at all commend themselves to us in this House, but we recognised that they came to us supported by great weight and authority in another place, and we passed them, merely making such Amendments as were needed to make them worthy of a place on the Statute-book.

It is, therefore, a gross misrepresentation of the facts to say that this House is always to be found impeding and obstructing Liberal legislation. If your complaint is that we do not swallow your legislation *in globo*, then I say that you cannot devise any self-respecting Second Chamber which will be so complaisant as that. What a remarkable admission was made by the

Lord President last night when he said that in his view, no matter how courageously we amputated useless branches of this Assembly, no matter how vigorously we supplied it with new blood from outside, it would still remain an obstacle in the way of the kind of legislation which he and his friends desired. That point was admirably put by the noble and learned Lord, Lord Robertson, whose brief speech contained as much pointed argument and wit as I have ever heard collected in so short an utterance.

What, then, are the weak points which we have to take into consideration? I should say that what the House of Lords most suffers from is that it does not always do its work so well as it might, and that it often seems to the public outside to do it less well than it does. We have in this Assembly a vast weight of experience and authority, but I admit we are not always successful in bringing the whole of that great weight of wisdom and authority to bear upon the subjects which come before us. And this House is not entirely to blame for that. To my mind that result has been largely due to the conduct of the Government of the day. There has been constantly denied to this House the opportunity, to which it is entitled, of dealing carefully and deliberately with measures brought to it from the other House. That has been a crying evil in the past, and we on this side cannot divest ourselves of some responsibility in the matter; but never within the recollection of any Peer has that scandal been allowed to rise to such proportions as it reached at the end of the last session. At this moment we are threatened with a recurrence of that scandalous state of things—a recurrence which can scarcely fail to be upon an even more formidable scale. You have only to look at the programme of legislation announced at the beginning of this session, to consider the progress which has been made with that programme, and the fact that we have already almost arrived at the Whitsuntide holidays, and then to ask yourselves what chance there is of the business of the year coming before us either this summer or in an autumn session under circumstances which will render it possible for us to cope with it in a decent manner. I hope that is one of the questions which will be covered by the reference to the Committee proposed by my noble friend Lord Cawdor.

Looking in other directions, I hope the Committee will be able to devise some means of regularising the practice under which the work of the House is practically transacted by a limited number of Peers who make it their business to keep in touch with public affairs. To my mind, if this House has suffered in public estimation, this has been largely due to the apparent indifference of so large a number of the Members of your Lordships' House. I am not going to suggest that the whole 600 Members should be here night after night, but I do say that public opinion is shocked when upon rare occasions what I may call "the regular forces" are reinforced by "the territorial army" that obeys the summons of my noble friend Lord Waldegrave.

I have always been one of those who have been glad to see this House reinforced from time to time by the addition of life Peers. A large amount of new blood comes to us from time to time, and adds usefully to our ability to transact our business. But it is added in a somewhat haphazard fashion, and it may sometimes be said that the services rendered by those who are thus made recipients of the highest honour are not always so obvious as they might be to the public outside.

To-night we have to choose between two policies. The policy of the Government is, as I understand it, that these anomalies, the existence of which they do not deny, should remain uncorrected. They desire that these anomalies should continue to exist, and that they should be available as part of the stock-in-trade of the frequenters of public platforms. They are accordingly, unless I misunderstood the noble Earl opposite, going to boycott the Committee which Lord Cawdor desires to have appointed. On the other hand, they have concealed either in the recesses of their minds or in the pigeon-holes of their Departments, some scheme which shall greatly restrict the powers of this House, and presumably convert it from being a Chamber with powers analogous to those of the other House into something which I have heard described as little better than a debating club.

Our policy is surely the wiser one. We do not see our way to support the Second Reading of Lord Newton's Bill, although I for one welcome the courageous attempt he has made to grapple with the question. But there are features in his Bill which would not be acceptable to many of your Lordships, and I think we should approach the question with a better chance of dealing with it satisfactorily if we take the step advised by Lord Cawdor, and refer the whole question, including the Bill, to a specially appointed Committee. As to the spirit in which that inquiry should be approached, I agree with every word that fell from my noble friend on the Cross Benches. I trust that the Committee will address themselves to their task with a feeling not that they are called upon to invent a new constitution for the House of Lords, but they are to deal—and to deal respectfully—with an ancient institution which has done much good in the past, which, I believe, has a large hold upon the confidence and good will of this country and the position of which we on this side of the House, at any rate, desire to strengthen as far as we can.

*The LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of Ripon): My Lords, the noble Marquess who has just sat down has intimated to us that there are reasons which render it desirable that this debate should be brought to an early conclusion. I therefore find myself in a position not altogether free from difficulty, because I should have liked to make some observations upon the remarkable speech of my noble friend on the Cross Benches, and particularly that strange imagination which led him to say, in his picturesque language, that the Government are engaged in "snowballing" this House. But time will not permit that I should follow him in that portion of his speech, and I will therefore refrain from doing so.

One point which struck me in the whole course of this debate was the complete and rapid conversion of noble Lords opposite to opinions which they have always hitherto repudiated. If you look back at the history of the attempts which have been made in this House from time to time to do something to improve its constitution, you will find that they have been one and all repudiated by noble Lords opposite at the time. From the day when this House, by what I have always thought was scarcely a constitutional proceeding, refused to allow Lord Wensleydale under a patent of a life Peer to take his seat here, down to the time when they were deaf to the siren voice of my noble friend on the Cross Benches; to the time when they actually set aside and repudiated the small proposals of their own great Leader and forced Lord Salisbury to abandon them, and down to the present moment, they have always been opponents of reform in this House. I am not an opponent of the reform of this House; the ground upon which we object to the course which is now being taken is that we think that your Lordships are about to engage in this inquiry without that full knowledge of all the circumstances of the case which will enable you to come to a satisfactory conclusion.

We are very much indebted to Lord Newton for having brought this proposal before us, but I think that the present moment is inopportune. While I firmly believe that Lord Newton does desire the reform of this House, and while I recollect that he gave public notice of his intention to deal with this question in the present session before this session began, I am bound to say I do not think the same eager zeal has been manifested by others. There was one noble and learned Lord who spoke manfully, as he always does, of his opinions, but most of the others who have spoken in favour of reform, and particularly the noble Marquess who has just sat down, were very cautious as to what they said. The noble Marquess appeared to me to defend that which is the forefront evil of the present constitution of this House—that is to say, that the vast and overwhelming majority here is of one Party. I do not want to use strong language, but I venture to say that is a state of things that is utterly intolerable; it is completely out of date, and it has nothing to do with the present temper of the country and of public opinion. It is that great evil, amongst others, that requires reform.

But why do we ask you not to undertake this work at this moment? It is not because we do not wish noble Lords to reform this House; it is because, in the circumstances of the present moment, you have not, and you cannot have, the whole of the materials before you upon which you ought to form a judgment. When the proposals of the Government are made in the House of Commons with reference to the mode of dealing with differences between the two Houses, then your Lordships will see how you can best deal with those proposals and fit them in your scheme of constitutional reform if they commend themselves to your Lordships. It is surely admitted that it is a great evil that important measures should be lost by differences between the two Houses.

There are only two modes by which that question can be brought to a solution. One is by some arrangement for settling differences at the time and at once, and the other is by the process of a dissolution. That is really what is in the minds of a large majority of this House—that the people should have an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon measures of which you do not approve. What you mean, practically, is that this House should be able to force a dissolution. I venture to say that is no part of the function of this House. I cannot admit a remedy of that kind, a remedy which you can put in force whenever you please. So long as there is in this House a permanent majority of one Party you cannot expect a Liberal Government, or the House of Commons, to permit you to have a claim to force a dissolution whenever you please. You know that the time would come when the majority in this House would think an advantageous period had arrived for a dissolution, and the result would probably be that they would strive, by throwing out some measure, to force that dissolution upon the country. That is a process to which His Majesty's Government can give no aid; it is a process which they feel bound, on behalf of the country, to resist; and it is a process fraught with the greatest inconvenience and wholly unsatisfactory in its probable results.

We have had in the course of this discussion allusions to what was the question that had to be decided at the last general election; and we have been told that there were three great questions before the country. Supposing that you insisted upon a dissolution, and public business was checked until it was brought about, do you really think you could have a sort of *referendum* at a general election? When the general election was over it would be easy to say, "This was not the question that was submitted to the electors, it was that." It is not only an objectionable method of settling questions of this kind, it is a method which in many cases would settle nothing at all. Therefore we feel that you should wait until you know what are the principles of the proposals of the Government in regard to differences between the two Houses, and then, with full knowledge of the facts of the case, proceed upon the inquiry which you desire.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, I do not rise for the purpose of exercising the right of reply, but rather for the purpose of meeting what I believe to be the general desire of the House. I ask your Lordships leave to withdraw the Bill. My reason for doing so is not that I am convinced by the arguments of my opponents, but that I rely upon the assurances of my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition that the proposals in this Bill will be considered before the Committee. I do not profess to consider the appointment of this Committee an absolutely ideal solution of the question, but I am not going to stand upon forms. I will endeavour to console myself with the fact that this Committee is better than nothing at all, and, so far as I know, nobody before me has succeeded in obtaining even that concession.

Motion for the Second Reading, and Bill (by leave of the House) withdrawn.

EARL CAWDOR: I beg to move my Motion.

Moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the suggestions which have from time to time been made for increasing the efficiency of the House of Lords in matters affecting legislation, and to report as to the desirability of adopting them either in their original or in some modified form.—(*Earl Cawdor.*)

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name on the Paper.

Amendment moved—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'That' and to insert the words, 'in the opinion of this House it is not expedient to proceed with the discussion of various proposals for reforming the constitution of this House until provision has been made for an effective method of settling differences which may arise between this House and the other House of Parliament.'"—(*The Earl of Crewe.*)

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question," their Lordships divided:—Contents, 198; Not-Contents, 46.

## CONTENTS.

Canterbury, L. Abp.

Norfolk, D. (*E. Marshal.*)
Bedford, D.
Devonshire, D.
Grafton, D.
Northumberland, D.
Richmond and Gordon, D.
Rutland, D.
Wellington, D.

Abercorn, M. (*D. Abercorn.*)
Ailesbury, M.
Bath, M.
Camden, M.
Hertford, M.
Lansdowne, M.
Salisbury, M.
Winchester, M.
Zetland, M.

Amherst, E.
Ancaster, E.
Brownlow, E.
Cairns, E.
Camperdown, E.
Carlisle, E.
Carnwath, E.
Cathcart, E.
Cawdor, E.
Clarendon, E.
Cranbrook, E.
Dartmouth, E.
Darnley, E.
Dartrey, E.
De La Warr, E.
Denbigh, E.
Derby, E.
Devon, E.
Doncaster, E. (*D. Buccleuch and Queensberry.*)
Drogheda, E.
Ducie, E.
Dudley, E.
Egerton, E.
Feversham, E.
Fitzwilliam, E.
Fortescue, E.
Halsbury, E.
Hardwicke, E.
Harewood, E.
Harrington, E.
Jersey, E.
Kilmorey, E.
Lindsey, E.
Lucan, E.
Lytton, E.
Manvers, E.
Morley, E.
Morton, E.
Mount Edgcumbe, E.
Munster, E.
Northbrook, E.
Orford, E.
Saint Germans, E.
Scarbrough, E.
Shrewsbury, E.
Stamford, E.
Stanhope, E.
Stradbroke, E.
Vane, E. (*M. Londonderry.*)
Verulam, E.
Waldegrave, E. [*Teller.*]
Westmorland, E.
Wharncliffe, E.

Churchill, V. [*Teller.*]
Colville of Culross, V.
Cross, V.
Falkland, V.
Halifax, V.
Hardinge, V.
Hill, V.
Hutchinson, V. (*E. Donoughmore.*)
Iveagh, V.
Knutsford, V.
Milner, V.
Ridley, V.
Selby, V.

Bangor, L. Bp.

Abinger, L.
Addington, L.
Alington, L.
Allerton, L.
Alverstone, L.
Ampthill, L.
Ashbourne, L.
Ashcombe, L.
Atkinson, L.
Avebury, L.
Barnard, L.
Barrymore, L.
Belhaven and Stenton, L.
Belper, L.
Biddulph, L.
Blythswood, L.
Boyle, L. (*E. Cork and Orrery.*)
Braye, L.
Brougham and Vaux, L.
Burton, L.
Carysfort, L. (*E. Carysfort.*)
Cheylesmore, L.
Clements, L. (*E. Leitrim.*)
Clinton, L.
Colchester, L.
Crofton, L.
Dawnay, L. (*V. Downe.*)
De L'Isle and Dudley, L.
De Mauley, L.
De Saumarez, L.
Deramore, L.
Desborough, L.
Dormer, L.
Douglas, L. (*E. Home.*)
Dunmore, L. (*E. Dunmore.*)
Ellenborough, L.
Faber, L.
Forester, L.
Gage, L. (*V. Gage.*)
Hare, L. (*E. Listowel.*)
Harris, L.
Hatherton, L.
Hawke, L.
Hay, L. (*E. Kinnoul.*)
Heneage, L.
Hindlip, L.
Hothfield, L.
Hylton, L.
Inverclyde, L.
Kelvin, L.
Kenry, L. (*E. Dunraven and Mount-Earl.*)
Kenyon, L.
Kesteven, L.
Kintore, L. (*E. Kintore.*)
Knaresborough, L.
Lawrence, L.
Leconfield, L.
Leigh, L.
Llangattock, L.
Macnaghten, L.
Manners, L.
Meldrum, L. (*M. Huntly.*)
Middleton, L.
Monson, L.
Montagu of Beaulieu, L.
Monteagle, L. (*M. Sligo.*)
Monteagle of Brandon, L.
Mount Stephen, L.

Mowbray, L.
Muncaster, L.
Muskerry, L.
Newton, L.
North, L.
Oriel, L. (*V. Massereene.*)
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Playfair, L.
Poltimore, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Ranfurly, L. (*E. Ranfurly.*)
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth L.
Redesdale, L.
Revelstoke, L.
Ritchie of Dundee, L.
Robertson, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Rosmead, L.
Rothschild, L.
St. Levan, L.
St. Oswald, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sanderson, L.
Sandys, L.
Seaton, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Sinclair, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stalbridge, L.
Stanmore, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Suffield, L.
Templemore, L.
Tennyson, L.
Teynham, L.
Tweeddale, L. (*M. Tweeddale.*)
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford.*)
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wenlock, L.
Willoughby de Broke, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.

## NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Crewe, E. (*L. President.*)

Ripon, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Beauchamp, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Chichester, E.
Craven, E.
Kimberley, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Russell, E.
Temple, E.

Esher, V.

Aberdare, L.
Allendale, L.
Boston, L.
Brassey, L.
Burghclere, L.
Colebrook, L.
Coleridge, L.
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
Eversley, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Headley, L.
Joicey, L.
Knollys, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Overtoun, L.
Pirrie, L.
Reay, L.
Rendel, L.
Ribblesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Tweedmouth, L.
Wandsworth, L.
Weardale, L.
Welby, L.
Winterstoke, L.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

---

## IRISH TOBACCO BILL.

### [Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

**Lord ORANMORE and BROWNE:** My Lords, at this late hour I will not detain you for more than a minute in moving the Second Reading of this Bill. The object of the measure is to repeal the law which prohibits the growing of tobacco in Ireland. It is an extremely short Bill of only two operative clauses. The first provides for the repeal of the present Act prohibiting the growing of tobacco in Ireland, and gives power for the imposition of an excise duty. The second clause authorises the growth of tobacco for experimental purposes. The Bill has passed through the House of Commons with the unanimous consent of Irish Members, both Nationalist and Loyalist, and I believe it has the friendly support of His Majesty's Government. I hope, therefore, it will commend itself to your Lordships.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read $2^a$."—(*Lord Oranmore and Browne.*)

**Earl BEAUCHAMP:** His Majesty's Government offer no opposition to the passage of this Bill, which they regard with entire neutrality.

On Question, Bill read $2^a$, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Tuesday, 7th May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill.—Read the Third time, and passed.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill (by Order); Cardiff Railway Bill (by Order); Leith Harbour and Docks Bill (by Order).—Orders for Second Reading, read and discharged; Bills withdrawn.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Barnstaple, Coventry, Honiton, and Wallasey," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 178.]

### RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).

Mr. SOAMES reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at Two of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

### MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill; Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill; Basingstoke Gas Bill; without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for transferring to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the endowments of the rectory of Sutton Coldfield, in the county of Warwick, and for providing for the re-endowment of the said rectory and for the application of the income and capital of the transferred endowments; and for other ecclesiastical purposes." [Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to consolidate, with amendments and additions, the provisions of the Acts relating to the Tees Valley Water Board." [Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to transfer the powers of the Kendal Fell Trustees to the Mayor, Alderman, and Burgesses of the borough of Kendal; to unite the townships within the borough into one parish; to abolish certain differential rating; and for other purposes." [Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board; to make the Bedwellty and Tredegar Urban District Councils constituent authorities; and for other purposes." [Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Metropolitan Railway Company to establish and regulate a pension fund; and for other purposes." [Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords].

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [Lords]; Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

## *PETITIONS.*

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Forfar, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirriemuir, against; to lie upon the Table.

Mowbray, L.
Muncaster, L.
Muskerry, L.
Newton, L.
North, L.
Oriel, L. (*V. Massereene.*)
Oranmore and Browne, L.
Ormathwaite, L.
Playfair, L.
Poltimore, L.
Ponsonby, L. (*E. Bessborough.*)
Ranfurly, L. (*E. Ranfurly.*)
Rathmore, L.
Ravensworth L.
Redesdale, L.
Revelstoke, L.
Ritchie of Dundee, L.
Robertson, L.
Rosebery, L. (*E. Rosebery.*)
Rosmead, L.
Rothschild, L.
St. Levan, L.
St. Oswald, L.
Saltoun, L.
Sanderson, L.
Sandys, L.
Seaton, L.
Shute, L. (*V. Barrington.*)
Sinclair, L.
Somerhill, L. (*M. Clanricarde.*)
Stalbridge, L.
Stanmore, L.
Stewart of Garlies, L. (*E. Galloway.*)
Sudley, L. (*E. Arran.*)
Suffield, L.
Templemore, L.
Tennyson, L.
Teynham, L.
Tweeddale, L. (*M. Tweeddale.*)
Tyrone, L. (*M. Waterford.*)
Wemyss, L. (*E. Wemyss.*)
Wenlock, L.
Willoughby de Broke, L.
Wolverton, L.
Wynford, L.

## NOT-CONTENTS.

Loreburn, L. (*L. Chancellor.*)

Crewe, E. (*L. President.*)

Ripon, M. (*L. Privy Seal.*)

Beauchamp, E.
Carrington, E.
Chesterfield, E.
Chichester, E.
Craven, E.
Kimberley, E.
Portsmouth, E.
Russell, E.
Temple, E.

Esher, V.

Aberdare, L.
Allendale, L.
Boston, L.
Brassey, L.
Burghclere, L.
Colebrook, L.
Coleridge, L.
Dunning, L. (*L. Rollo.*)
Elgin, L. (*E. Elgin and Kincardine.*)
Eversley, L.
Fitzmaurice, L.
Glantawe, L.
Granard, L. (*E. Granard.*) [*Teller.*]
Hamilton of Dalzell, L.
Haversham, L.
Headley, L.
Joicey, L.
Knollys, L.
O'Hagan, L.
Overtoun, L.
Pirrie, L.
Reay, L.
Rendel, L.
Ribblesdale, L. [*Teller.*]
Sandhurst, L.
Saye and Sele, L.
Sefton, L. (*E. Sefton.*)
Stanley of Alderley, L.
Tweedmouth, L.
Wandsworth, L.
Weardale, L.
Welby, L.
Winterstoke, L.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

---

## IRISH TOBACCO BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD ORANMORE AND BROWNE: My Lords, at this late hour I will not detain you for more than a minute in moving the Second Reading of this Bill. The object of the measure is to repeal the law which prohibits the growing of tobacco in Ireland. It is an extremely short Bill of only two operative clauses. The first provides for the repeal of the present Act prohibiting the growing of tobacco in Ireland, and gives power for the imposition of an excise duty. The second clause authorises the growth of tobacco for experimental purposes. The Bill has passed through the House of Commons with the unanimous consent of Irish Members, both Nationalist and Loyalist, and I believe it has the friendly support of His Majesty's Government. I hope, therefore, it will commend itself to your Lordships.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read $2^{a}$."—(*Lord Oranmore and Browne.*)

EARL BEAUCHAMP: His Majesty's Government offer no opposition to the passage of this Bill, which they regard with entire neutrality.

On Question, Bill read $2^{a}$, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Tuesday, 7th May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill.—Read the Third time, and passed.

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill (by Order); Cardiff Railway Bill (by Order); Leith Harbour and Docks Bill (by Order).—Orders for Second Reading, read and discharged; Bills withdrawn.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Barnstaple, Coventry, Honiton, and Wallasey," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 178.]

### RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).

Mr. SOAMES reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday, at Two of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

### MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to:—London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill; Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill; Basingstoke Gas Bill; without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for transferring to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners the endowments of the rectory of Sutton Coldfield, in the county of Warwick, and for providing for the re-endowment of the said rectory and for the application of the income and capital of the transferred endowments; and for other ecclesiastical purposes." [Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to consolidate, with amendments and additions, the provisions of the Acts relating to the Tees Valley Water Board." [Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to transfer the powers of the Kendal Fell Trustees to the Mayor, Alderman, and Burgesses of the borough of Kendal; to unite the townships within the borough into one parish; to abolish certain differential rating; and for other purposes." [Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board; to make the Bedwellty and Tredegar Urban District Councils constituent authorities; and for other purposes." [Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Metropolitan Railway Company to establish and regulate a pension fund; and for other purposes." [Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords].

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [Lords]; Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

## *PETITIONS.*

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Forfar, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirriemuir, against; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirriemuir, against; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Barry, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against:—From Cottered; Cowley St. John; Forest Gate; Headon with Upton; Kensington; Lichfield; Windsor; and, Woolwich; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petitions for legislation:—From Leicester; and, Llanelly; to lie upon the Table.

### SMALL HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Forfar, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.

Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

---

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS' (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.

Return [presented 6th May]; to be printed. [No. 139.]

### COLLEGE CHARTER ACT, 1871 (COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AT SOUTH KENSINGTON.

Copy presented, of application received from the Board of Education for the establishment of a College of Science and Technology at South Kensington, referred by His Majesty in Council for the Consideration and Report of a Committee of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council; together with a Copy of the draft of the Charter applied for [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3774 to 3776 (by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### EAST INDIA (FINANCIAL STATEMENT).

Presented, relative thereto [Address 2nd May; *Sir Henry Fowler*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 140].

---

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

### Reinstatement of Irish Evicted Tenant—Case of Patrick Collins.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the present occupier of a farm on the Saughton Estate, in the county of Cork, from which Patrick Collins was evicted, has consented to surrender the holding to Collins; that this farm has been visited by three inspectors from the Estates Commissioners; that these Reports were favourable to the reinstatement of the evicted tenant Collins; and that the present occupier and the evicted tenant were both satisfied with the terms suggested by the several inspectors; and, will he say what is the cause of the delay in restoring the evicted tenant to his old holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners understand that the occupying tenant of the holding from which Patrick Collins was evicted is willing to surrender the farm on the terms suggested by them, and arrangements are now being made for the reinstatement of Collins and for giving him assistance by way of free grant as soon as he receives possession.

### Transfer of Postman Thomas Connolly, of Castle Street, Antrim.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General if an application for transfer has been received from Thomas Connolly, postman, Castle Street, Antrim; how long has the applicant been in his present appointment; when did he first apply for a transfer; and will he be considered in connection with the first vacancy.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) An application for transfer, dated the

21st of November, 1905, has been received from Thomas Connolly, who was appointed to his present and first situation as postman on the 13th of July, 1903. His application will be considered in connection with any vacancies which may occur at the towns to which he desires transfer. But he has no claim to a transfer, and, owing to the claims of local candidates at the offices referred to and of other established applicants for transfer, there is, I regret to say, little or no prospect of his request being complied with at present.

### Appointment to Birr Postmastership.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state, with reference to the recent vacancy in the postmastership of Birr and the invitation in respect of this vacancy, the number of applications received; how many came from officers serving in Ireland, England, and Scotland, respectively; whether he can state the length of service and previous experience of the officer appointed; whether the appointee was the senior of those applying; and, if not, whether he can state the length of service of the most senior official from whom an application was received serving in Ireland, England, and Scotland, and to what offices attached.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) As I have already informed the hon. Member, it is not customary to publish particulars of the applications received.

### Postal Facilities in Kilkenny and Castlecomer.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that a parcel posted in Kilkenny on Friday afternoon will not be delivered in Castlecomer, ten miles distant, until the following Monday; and whether, in view of the inconvenience to the traders of Kilkenny and Castlecomer, and to the public generally, anything will be done, either by reverting to the old system or providing fresh facilities, to expedite communication between both centres.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am making inquiry on this subject, and will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

### Merchant Shipping Bill—Hearing of Counsel at the Committee Stage.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the question of tonnage has recently been thoroughly investigated by several Committees and a Commission at great cost to the shipping interests involved; and that, in the case of the Merchant Shipping Bill, the cross-Channel companies are agreed in opposing counsel being heard at the Committee Stage because of the cost which it would involve; whether he is aware that in the case of harbour authorities the cost of counsel is defrayed by the port; and whether, in view of these circumstances, he will undertake to advise that counsel should not be heard at the Committee Stage of the Bill.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in connection with the proposed Bill to amend Section 78 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, he has considered the question of exempting from its operation cross-Channel steamers at present in commission, a number of which, at present engaged in traffic between Irish and English ports, being of a new type and constructed quite recently under Board of Trade supervision, affording increased facilities and comfort to the travelling public, and built at an increased cost, in good faith that the additional expenditure would not be saddled with an extra tax, and seeing that these cross-Channel steamers are already handicapped with legislation and competition, he has considered that these steamers use ports that they run to daily and are liable for dues each time, whereas other classes of steamers can stay in port for days or weeks and only pay the same amount in duties that the cross-Channel steamers do every day; whether he is aware that the regular cross-Channel steamers pay from six to twelve times heavier dues to the port authorities than other classes of steamers, and that at Belfast the cross-Channel steamers contribute the major portion of the revenue of the port while occupying a small portion of the quays;

and whether, in view of all these circumstances, he will undertake that the provisions of the new Bill will apply only to such steamers as are built in the future, and not to those at present in commission, or otherwise consider the advisability of altering the term sixty to sixty-five in the new Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I will reply together to the two Question the hon. Member has on the Paper. I am quite aware of the circumstances to which he calls attention, and I have had a conference with the representatives of the several interests concerned in the Government Tonnage Bill now before this House, which has resulted in what I hope may prove a satisfactory (although not quite unanimous) compromise. The terms of this agreement will appear in Amendments which I propose to put on the Paper, and which I think will be found to go far towards meeting the points raised by the hon. Member.

### The Bankruptcy of the State Banking Corporation, Limited.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has received the Report of the official receiver on the public examination of the directors of the State Banking Corporation, Limited; and if he intends to take any steps in regard to the prosecution of the late directors for misfeasance.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The Report of the official receiver on the public examination of the directors of the State Banking Corporation, Limited, has been received and is receiving the careful consideration of the Board of Trade.

### Naval Officers and the Customs Staff.

MR. CLYNES (Manchester, N.E.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that thirty-two commanders and lieutenants of the Royal Navy are to be appointed to superior positions in the Customs staff; what are their qualifications for appointments; and are such apointments, together with that of Commander Graham, in accordance with the Goschen minutes, which guaranteed positions to officers serving in the Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The Board of Customs inform me that they have no such proposal under consideration. As regards that part of the Question which concerns Commander Graham, I have nothing to add to my reply of the 27th March last to the hon. Member for Gravesend.†

### Cavan Land Appeal Cases.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the decisions will be delivered of the land appeal cases heard at Cavan, on the 15th January last, for the information of those tenants whose rents are now demanded.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission expect that judgment will be given in about thirty of the cases referred to in the course of next week. As to the remaining cases, it is expected that the assessor will have completed his Reports in the course of the next ten days, whereupon the cases will be considered by the Judicial Commissioner, and judgment will follow.

### Ordnance Survey Travelling Expenses.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether military warrants are issued to the railway and shipping companies for the conveyance of soldiers and civilians employed on the Ordnance Survey; and whether the charges for the conveyance of those passengers are debited against Army Votes.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Military warrants are issued for the conveyance of soldiers belonging to the Survey Companies of Royal Engineers only in connection with their military training, and the charges are debited to Army Funds. Conveyance in connection with survey duties is arranged for by the Director General of Ordnance Survey, a separate form of warrant, chargeable against the Survey Vote, being issued for the conveyance.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 1816–7.

### New Army Scheme and the Permanent Staff of the Auxiliary Forces.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War what arrangements he proposes to make as regards the adjutants and sergeant-instructors on the permanent staff of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer regiments upon their dissolution under the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill to prevent hardship; and if he will take care that they have at least twelve months notice of any intention to dispense with their services or the equivalent in cash.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am not at present prepared to state in detail how the officers and non-commissioned officers now serving on the permanent staff of the Auxiliary Forces will be affected under the Bill, but the hon. and gallant Member may rest assured that every consideration possible will be accorded to them.

## QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

### Night Training on Warships.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the average number of complete nights spent under way at sea since the beginning of the year to the last day of April by the battleships which have been continuously in commission with nucleus crews, viz., "Magnificent," "Centurion," "Majestic," "Glory," and "Empress of India," which now form part of the Home Fleet.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee): It has not been considered practicable to give night training at sea to any considerable extent to nucleus crews which only comprised two-fifths of a ship's complement. This was one of the reasons for manning ships of the Home Fleet with a larger percentage of their full complement. The period to which the hon. Member's question refers is one of transition, and the Home Fleet is only now about to commence its first combined cruise. No figures can therefore yet be given.

### Royal Marine Artillery and Light Infantry.

Mr. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that, under the new scheme of training, the officers for the Royal Marine Artillery and Royal Marine Light Infantry will commence their duties at about twenty-three years of age as captains, and there will only be a sufficient number of such officers for captains' duties, he can state if any other source of supply will be available, except warrant officers, to do the duties of subalterns.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The details of the scheme have not yet been settled as regards the point mentioned in the Question. But I must guard myself against the assumption that the number of future lieutenants (M) will only be sufficient for the duties now performed by captains of Royal Marines.

### Rosyth.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the adjustment of the prices for the naval base at Rosyth was negotiated by the Admiralty officials themselves; whether independent valuations were previously obtained, and who were the independent valuators and what were the amounts of these valuations; and whether these valuations recommended the payment by the nation of about £100,000 (and an additional sum for minerals) for 911 acres, which were rented at the time of purchase at the annual sum of £1,288 15s. in the case of the lands purchased from Lord Linlithgow and of similar sums for the smaller purchase from a neighbouring proprietor.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I understand that the adjustment of prices was not negotiated by Admiralty officials. Independent valuation was previously obtained, the valuators being Sir Thomas Binnie and Mr. J. Campbell Murray. Lord Linlithgow's property was valued by them at £91,920, exclusive of minerals, and Mr. Newton's property at £20,811, including minerals. The price for the minerals on Lord Linlithgow's estate was settled by arbitration at £12,250. In all cases the prices paid were recommended for acceptance by the independent valuators after considerable negotiation.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): Were the negotiations for Rosyth initiated before any suggestion was made to the Australian Governments to increase the Marquess of Linlithgow's salary ?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the matter was one dealt with by the last Government.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): In view of the increase in the value of adjoining property owing to the establishment of Rosyth as a naval station, will any endeavour be made to secure any part of that increased value for the State, so as to help pay the large prices——

*MR SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice should be given of that Question.

### Horses for the Army.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the rapid increase of automobile traffic, the consequent decrease of horses, and the certainty of shortage in the event of war, he will take steps to cope with the difficulty.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): As I informed the hon. Member for the Oswestry division of Shropshire on the 28th February last, in answer to a similar inquiry, the whole question of the supply of horses in time of war is being very thoroughly considered.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Having regard to the exigencies of the service, will the right hon. Gentleman take into his most favourable consideration the desirability of providing Shire horses for mounted officers exceeding twenty stone in weight ?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Woolwich Mechanics for Germany.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that another party of skilled mechanics from Woolwich Arsenal embarked at Dover on 1st May on their way to Germany, having been engaged for work in one of the arsenals there; and, in view of the probable shortage of skilled labour in our arsenal in time of war, and the advantage to a foreign Power and the disadvantage to our own country being palpable, he will reconsider his decision with regard to the discharges still pending at Woolwich.

MR. HALDANE: It is manifestly impracticable to maintain the establishments of skilled workmen at the Ordnance Factories on a war footing in time of peace. As regards the specific question of discharges, I have nothing to add to the full statements which I have recently made to the House. I may add that I have no knowledge of the supposed emigration of workmen to continental arsenals, nor do I attach much importance to the rumour.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): Did the notice of dismissal to these men include a recommendation that they should emigrate to some other country ?

MR. HALDANE asked for notice of the Question.

### Militia Garrison Artillery.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the fact that the value of the gun ammunition annually expended in the past by the Militia Garrison Artillery was about £12,000, and that no ammunition is to be issued for their training this year, although there is sufficient surplus ammunition available, the changes contemplated in that force will render such gun practice useless; and, if so, will the ammunition saved this year become obsolete.

MR. HALDANE: The reply is in the negative. The ammunition which would have probably been used by the Royal Garrison Artillery Militia will be available for other practice with similar guns in ensuing years.

### Indian Budget.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can now say when the Indian Budget will be taken; when the Explanatory Memorandum will be issued to Members; and whether he will arrange that it be so framed as to group the more important items of expenditure under headings, as was the usage up to the year 1898.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): I have already stated on two or three occasions that I hope that the discussion will take place in the first week or ten days after the Whitsun holidays. The Explanatory Memorandum is now in the hands of the printers and will be distributed as soon as possible. I do not understand the exact nature of the change in arrangement which my hon. friend desires, but if he will favour me with his suggestions in detail, they will be borne in mind next year.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Will the hon. Gentleman do his best to expedite the issue of the Memorandum?

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: It will be distributed as soon as possible.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): And the Report of the Budget debate also?

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I do not think there will be any difficulty about that.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE: Can we have it a week before the Budget is taken, so that hon. Members may have an opportunity of absorbing the information it contains?

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I cannot do more than promise it as soon as possible.

### Port-of-Spain Town Commissioners.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state whether the qualification for a town commissionership at Port-of-Spain has been fixed at an annual rental of £20; and whether, seeing that such a rental will debar a representative of the working class from being appointed to such a position, he is prepared to take any action in the matter with a view to the qualification being put on a more democratic basis, an annual rental of £12.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): I do not know whether the Ordinance which has been introduced to provide for the constitution of the Port-of-Spain Town Board has been passed by the Legislature of Trinidad, and I am therefore unable to furnish the hon. Member with the information he seeks. But in any case the qualification for a town commissionership at Port-of-Spain appears to be a matter which should be left in the first instance at any rate to the discretion of the local Legislature.

MR. SUMMERBELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman get the information?

MR. CHURCHILL: The Ordinance will come over in due course, and I will take care the point raised by the hon. Member is borne in mind.

### Emigration from the West India Islands.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state whether a record is kept of all emigrants from Trinidad and the other West India Islands, under permission of the various local governments, to the Panama Canal; and, if so, could he further state whether any undertaking is given by the United States Government for the safe return of such emigrants in case of failure to carry out the work through no fault of the said emigrants.

MR. CHURCHILL: Emigration from Trinidad to Panama is not controlled by any special Ordinance, and though the form of contract entered into by the emigrants has been approved by the Governor, the Secretary of State is not aware that any special record is kept of persons emigrating to Panama. The approved form of contract contains provision for the repatriation of the emigrant at his desire on the determination of his contract. Emigrants from Jamaica to Panama must obtain a permit from the Colonial authorities, and provision is made by law to enable all emigrants recruited under contract to return to their homes. The laws of most of the other West Indian Colonies contain provisions enabling the Governor to control the recruitment of labour for service outside the Colony, but the Secretary of State is not aware that any special terms have been imposed in the case of recruitment for Panama.

### Nairobi Prison.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): On behalf of the hon. Member for Winchester, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when it is expected that the new prison at Nairobi will be completed; and what expenditure will be required after the close of 1907–8.

MR. CHURCHILL: The amount estimated to be required for the completion of the prison after the close of 1907–8 is £10,029. It is not possible to name a date on which the prison will be completed.

### British Indians in the Transvaal.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can afford any assurance that the regulations which are to be framed under the Ordinance for the registration of British Indians in the Transvaal will be free from any humiliating and degrading conditions, ordinarily applicable to convicts and ticket-of-leave men only, such as finger-print impressions of the ten digits for purposes of indentification, which can equally well be secured by other methods.

MR. CHURCHILL: General Botha has given His Majesty's Government the assurance that the regulations will be revised with a view to removing so far as possible conditions which are undesirable.

### The Assouan Dam.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether the cost of raising the Assouan Dam will be defrayed out of the annual revenue of Egypt.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (SIR EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The cost of raising the Assouan Dam will be defrayed out of the reserve fund of the Egyptian Government formed from the surplus revenues of past years.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, whether the offer of Messrs. Aird to raise the Assouan Dam for £E1,037,000, which has been accepted, was the only offer received for this work; whether it was the only offer asked for; and whether any opportunity was afforded to other firms to tender for this contract.

SIR E. GREY: Messrs. Aird were the original constructors of the Assouan Dam, and their former experience clearly indicated them as the proper people to continue the work, which had been very well done, and at a reasonable cost. The Public Works Department made their own estimates and the terms were arranged with Messrs. Aird. I have no doubt whatever that the course adopted was the best. It was important in the interest both of economy and security that the special experience gained in constructing the dam originally should be utilised in continuing it.

MR. BOWLES: Is there any reason to believe that the work of raising this dam was such as particularly to require great experience? Will the right hon. Baronet consider the advisability of seeing that in future the Egyptian Government in dealing with large matters of this kind give other firms of standing a reasonable opportunity of tendering in the interest both of Egyptian finance and of the Egyptian taxpayer?

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): When is there likely to be another dam required?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I understand that in the first place Messrs. Aird were not the only firm consulted. But it was known that they had special experience of this dam, and it is a matter of common knowledge that the work was of a special character, requiring special care.

MR. J. WARD: Was any suggestion made to the contractors that they should employ British workmen in preference to Italians in the construction of the dam?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware of any condition of that kind being made.

### Egyptian Excise Duties.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the excise duty of 8 per cent. imposed upon the manufactures of the Egyptian Cotton Mills Company, Limited, a British company established in Egypt, has already absorbed one-eighth of the company's capital, thereby practically destroying this industry, and that in consequence of the imposition of such duty the company is on the point of giving up business; and whether, in order to save from forced liquidation one of the few industrial companies in Egypt, he will advise the Egyptian Government to abolish or reduce such excise duty.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Excise duty has been in force for some years and corresponds to the import duty. It cannot be abolished or reduced without finding some other source of revenue and raising the whole question of fiscal policy and other difficulties of which we have had experience in connection with cotton duties in India. I am not anxious to see the Egyptian Government raise these questions, nor to take the responsibility of suggesting new taxes to them.

### Sunday Closing in Cairo.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, Egypt being a Moslem country and Friday being the day of rest according to the religion of Islam, it is competent to compel shops to close on Sunday; whether a chief constable, accompanied by a staff of policemen, on the 3rd of February last, forcibly compelled shops in Cairo to close on that day, and, if so, under what law or regulation such action was taken; and whether State administrations, departments, and public offices, or any, and which, of them, are closed, and, if so, during what hours and under what regulations, on Sunday.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information on this subject, nor am I aware of any reason for making inquiry about it.

### Egyptian Departmental Reports.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Egyptian Government, acting upon the advice of the British Agent and Consul-General, or of its own accord, have refused to communicate to the Legislative Council some, and what, Reports to the Ministers or Departments of State, in spite of repeated requests addressed by the Council to the Government to have such Reports laid before them; and whether he will direct the British Agent and Consul-General to advise the Egyptian Government henceforth to communicate all such Reports to the said Council, or, if not, will he state the reason for not doing so.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware that there is any obligation to communicate such Reports to the Legislative Council. I will inquire whether the Legislative Council have asked for Papers, and if so for what Papers. But there is no intention of interfering with the discretion of the Egyptian Government as to what Reports should be made public, a discretion which it is necessary for every Government to have.

### Egypt's Western Frontier.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether negotiations are proceeding between the Turkish and the Egyptian Governments with the object of delimiting Egypt's western frontier; whether, without prejudice to the public interest, he can state the stage which such negotiations have reached; and what are the prospects of a satisfactory settlement.

SIR EDWARD GREY: No negotiations are proceeding at present between the Turkish and Egyptian Governments with the object of delimiting the western frontier of Egypt.

### Agricultural Grants.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the amount to be granted by Parliament to the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries in respect of agricultural and dairy education for 1907–8 is £12,100; and, if so, what is the corresponding amount provided for the same purposes in the Estimates for the Scottish Education Department and the Irish Department of Agriculture.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): The amount provided on the Board of Agriculture's Vote is as stated by the hon. Member. £7,650 has been taken for the same purpose in the Vote for Public Education, Scotland (Subhead M.). The amount spent upon this service in Ireland is provided out of the Endowment Fund of the Department of Agriculture (Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899). I am informed that the total allocation for the agricultural year ending 30th September 1907, is £65,390.

Mr. ASHLEY: In view of the amount given to Scotland and Ireland, cannot the Government give more than £12,000 to England?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Income-Tax Incidence.

Mr. WATT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he proposes to levy for income-tax at the unearned rate interest on money formerly earned by the personal exertion of the income-tax payer, and laid aside by means of his frugality.

Mr. ASQUITH: Yes, Sir. As I have already explained to the House, my proposal is that the relief should be confined to current earnings.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he proposes to find means by which some relief can be obtained by a payer of income-tax on the three years average system when the amount so taxed in any year is in excess of the actual year's income; and, if not, whether he will consider how severely this will affect a numerous class of persons whose income steadily diminishes and does not recover.

Mr. ASQUITH: The 133rd Section of the Income Tax Act, 1842 (as amended) was intended to secure this object. Its effect, however, is that the "average" ceases to be an average, as under it traders escape from the result of averaging when it tells against them, but obtain the benefit of it when it results in their favour. Following the recommendation of the late Lord Ritchie's Committee, I therefore propose to abolish the provision. It is to be hoped that the class alluded to in the latter part of the Question is not really numerous.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: Does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that this provision has only been used by traders when it tells in their favour, and that it has not been used when it was to their disadvantage? Was not that the intention of it?

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in arriving at the three years average of profits for income-tax assessment, he proposes to permit the income-tax payer, in making his average, to deduct the amount of loss in any of the three years, when such loss may occur, from the summation of the years of profit, so that the assessment shall be calculated upon the average of the actual income the tax-payer shall have received during the three years.

Mr. ASQUITH: This is secured by the present practice, with which I do not propose to interfere.

### Grants-in-Aid to Local Authorities.

Mr. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is his intention to guarantee the local authorities from any diminution of income arising under the heads of Local Exchequer Accounts and Grants-in-Aid under the new scheme for the abolition of Grants-in-Aid and Local Exchequer contributions; and, if not, will he consider the advisability of taking over the cost of police and other expenditure which was imposed on the local authorities when the Grants-in-Aid and Exchequer contributions were allotted.

Mr. ASQUITH: No, Sir. I am not proposing to make any alteration in the amount payable to the local taxation account, which will continue to be equal to the yield from year to year of the duties now assigned to that account at their present rates. The change is entirely without prejudice to the question of future adjustments as between local funds and the Exchequer with respect to the cost of services of the kind referred to in the latter part of the Question. That question does not arise upon the present proposals, and it remains to be dealt with upon its merits, when opportunity arises.

### Weights and Measures Act—New Regulations.

DR. HAZEL (West Bromwich): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the continued delay in the final issue of the general regulations for the guidance of local authorities in the execution and performance of their duties under the Weights and Measures Acts, which regulations the Board of Trade was empowered to make, by Section 5 of The Weights and Measures Act, 1904, and which were issued in draft in September, 1906, after consideration by a Departmental Committee, and the uncertainty resulting from such delay are detrimental to the interests of manufacturers and traders, particularly those who are concerned in the manufacture and sale of the scales, weights, and measures, and furthermore hinder the efficient administration of the Weights and Measures Acts; and whether, seeing that these regulations were announced to come into force first on 1st January and subsequently on 1st May, 1907, he can say what is the cause of the delay and when the regulations will be issued.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The draft circulated in September last was a provisional one pending consultation with local authorities and the final Report of the Committee has not yet been received. Every effort will be made to expedite the settlement of the regulations, but I cannot at present name a date for their issue.

### Baker Street and Waterloo Railway—Overcrowding.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been drawn to the continued overcrowding of the Baker Street and Waterloo Railway at certain hours; if he can say how long the trains of six and four cars, which were to have been substituted for three-car trains on 21st March last, were running, and if they have since been discontinued; and whether he will make representations to the company with a view to securing better accommodation.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am in communication with the railway company in this matter, and will inform the hon. Member of the result.

### Board of Trade Labour Commissioners.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, if, in view of the fact that the Commercial Labour and Statistical Department of the Board of Trade comprises a labour commissioner, an assistant labour commissioner, a chief labour correspondent, nine investigators and labour correspondents, and three assistants for special inquiries, he will arrange for one at least of these officials to take in hand the case of the mechanics discharged from Woolwich Arsenal who have taken contracts to work for a firm at Dresden, Germany, for upwards of twelve months, to advise and assist them as far as possible in their attempts to obtain work, and to supply them with the names of the other firms in Germany who are said to be anxious to engage them.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It is the duty of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade to watch and report on general changes in the state of employment, but it is no part of the functions of the officials of the Department to assist individual workmen to obtain work, and the Department has no organisation for the purpose.

### Vaccination Declarations.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether it is intended that any, and, if so, what, fees shall be chargeable by commissioners of oaths and other officers in respect of declarations made under the recently introduced measure dealing with vaccination; and whether he will consider the desirability of inserting in the Bill an express provision with regard to this.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The provisions of the existing law with regard to fees in respect of statutory declarations will apply to declarations for the purposes of the Bill. Where a statutory declaration is made before a commissioner for oaths the fee is 1s. 6d. As regards fees payable when a declaration is made before a justice or magistrate, the charge in the Metropolitan Police Courts is 1s., whilst elsewhere it depends on the Table of Justices' Clerks' Fees in force whether any, and, if so, what, fee is payable. In the Model Table of Fees issued by the Secretary of State the suggested fee for a declaration is 1s. I may add that a fee of 1s. 6d. or 2s. is payable now in most cases where a certificate of conscientious objection is obtained under Section 2 of the Vaccination Act, 1898.

### Valuation Bill.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board when it is probable that the Valuation Bill will be introduced.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am not able to fix a date at present.

### South Kensington College of Science.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the charter of incorporation of the governing body of the new College of Science at South Kensington is prepared, and when it will be laid upon the Table.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The draft charter will be laid upon the Table to-day.

### Victoria and Albert Museum, South Kensington.

SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford University): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what steps are being taken for the appointment of an advisory committee for the arrangement and organisation of the art collections of the Victoria and Albert Museum at South Kensington.

MR. MCKENNA: This matter is under my careful consideration, but I am not yet in a position to make any statement on the subject.

### Llanelian Schoolmaster's Salary.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Denbighshire local education authority have declined to pay the salary of the master of the Llanelian school; whether, on the appeal of the managers, a public inquiry was held into the matter last October, and what was the report of the inspector; whether the Board have arrived at any decision on the matter; and, if so, what that decision is.

MR. MCKENNA: I was informed yesterday that the local education authority have agreed to pay the salary of the master at the Llanelian school, and I trust that the differences between the authority and the managers are now settled.

### Redirection of Letters.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he will say whether letters are re-addressed at the Post Office when the Post Office authorities are requested to do so by householders who have gone away temporarily, leaving servants behind, or the house empty, or on change of residence permanently; and will he state what are the general rules applicable to re-addressing householders' letters by the Post Office, whether requested to do so or not.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The principle which the Post Office adopts is to limit official re-direction, which involves considerable additional trouble, to cases in which private re-direction cannot be arranged. When a householder's letters can be sent on to him by his servants the Post Office does not undertake the re-direction. When a householder removes permanently, or is temporarily from home leaving his house empty, the Post Office re-directs the letters when requested to do so.

### Lighting the Mall.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works when the new standards for electric light will be erected along the Mall.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): I am not yet able to fix a date. The model is in course of progress.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): When is the improvement likely to be completed, and the houses facing Trafalgar Square pulled down?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. That does not arise out of the Question on the Paper.

### Burwell Farm.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he will state the proportions of the £1,800 spent on the adaptation of Burwell farm to small holdings under the heads of fencing, farm buildings, and housing.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg also to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, how many cottages for housing eighty-two small holders on the Burwell farm were provided out of the sum of £1,800 which has been invested by the Crown in equipping these holdings.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The £1,800 has been spent approximately as follows:—£190 on fencing, £880 in providing one new small homestead and in altering and adding five other homesteads, £730 in altering and adding to nine cottages, and providing dairies, extra bedrooms, and outbuildings to adapt them as cottage farmhouses. No new cottages have been erected. The farm, as taken over, included a farmhouse and seventeen cottages and the majority of the tenants continue to live in the adjoining village of Burwell. The total number of holdings is seventy-five, made up as follows: forty-eight allotments under 5 acres, fourteen small holdings between 5 and 15 acres, and thirteen small holdings over 15 acres.

### Corrupt Practices Act in Scotland.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he is aware that merchants and traders in Scotland are finding that the Corrupt Practices Act of 1906 is being systematically ignored, in that bribes from sellers are being regularly accepted by servants of buyers; that these sellers fear to expose such bribery, holding that their position would be made worse by so doing; and if he will indicate what line of action the prosecuting authorities are prepared to take in dealing with this state of matters.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): No reports have reached me as to the failure of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1906, to the extent suggested by my hon. friend. No doubt there may be evasions in the circumstances mentioned; but the only course that can be followed by the criminal authorities is to set the machinery of the Act in motion when contraventions of its provisions come to their notice by information lodged or otherwise.

### Warden Estate Evicted Tenants.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that one of the Warden estate, Sneem, county Kerry, evicted tenants who returned from America last December has not yet been reinstated, and that, although grants were passed last year for building houses and purchasing stock, some of the tenants reinstated have not yet received grants for stock and nothing has been done in the way of building; and whether, seeing that these tenants have had to pay interest on their purchase money, steps will be taken to complete the issue of the grants for these two purposes; and can he say what steps, if any, will be taken to secure the reinstatement of the six evicted tenants whose holdings are situate on that portion of the estate hitherto excluded from sale.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange; for Mr. Birrell): The Estates Commissioners inform me that they are unable to identify the particular evicted tenants referred to in the Question, but if the names of these persons are supplied to them they will make further inquiries. The Commissioners have sanctioned grants for the improvement of the estate in question, but the actual outlay has been delayed pending the settlement of a certain legal question. This question is under consideration.

### Abbeyleix Boycotting Case.

COLONEL McCALMONT (Antrim, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that three persons, Dunne, Jackson, and Draper, residing at Abbeyleix, in Queen's County, have been boycotted for doing what they have a legal right to do, namely, taking grazing lands; and if proper precautions have been or will be taken to prevent these persons being persecuted.

MR. CHERRY (for Mr. BIRRELL): I am informed by the police authorities that the persons named in the Question have recently suffered some inconvenience and annoyance but have not been seriously boycotted. The police are taking all possible steps to secure that these persons shall not be interfered with in the exercise of their legal rights.

COLONEL McCALMONT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one of these persons has to go ten miles to get the necessaries of life, and that another cannot sell his pigs in the market?

MR. CHERRY: The hon. and gallant Member has more information than I have.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Is there any illegal conspiracy in existence at this place?

MR. CHERRY: Not that I am aware of.

### Ennisnag Evicted Tenant.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what steps, if any, have been taken by the Estates Commissioners in the case of Richard Reddy, who was evicted from his holding at Ennisnag, county Kilkenny, the said holding being now occupied by a Mrs. L. Rooney of the same place; if Mrs. Rooney has been approached by the Estates Commissioners' inspector with a view to asking her to surrender the holding in favour of Reddy; and, if not, if steps have been taken to provide Reddy with an equivalent holding.

MR. CHERRY (for Mr. BIRRELL): The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have carefully investigated this case, and have decided to take no action in it, having regard to the third paragraph of Regulation 6 of those dated 13th February, 1906.

### Police Protection of Grazing Farms.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many grazing farms in Ireland were under police protection on 1st May, 1907; how many extra police were drafted into Athenry, Elphin, and Roscrea on 30th April and 1st May last; and what is the estimated cost of these precautionary measures.

MR. CHERRY (for Mr. BIRRELL): I am informed by the police authorities that on 1st instant 245 grazing farms in Ireland were under police protection. On 30th April twenty additional policemen were brought into the Athenry district. On the same date thirty-seven additional men were brought into Elphin, and on 1st May twenty-three men. On 30th April eight men were brought into Roscrea. In none of these cases were extra police employed in the legal sense of the term, seeing that the men belonged to the established force of the county and not to other counties. The total cost of bringing in the men referred to was £32 15s. As regards the Athenry district, I may add that an extra force of twenty five men belonging to the Reserve have been stationed in the district since 12th October, 1906, and an extra force of ten men belonging to another county have been there since 30th March last. The total cost of these extra forces has not yet been ascertained.

### Irish School Attendance Fines.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an order has recently been issued directing clerks of petty sessions to remit to Dublin Castle in future all fines recovered under the compulsory school attendance provisions of The Education (Ireland) Act, 1892; whether this has been done by his instructions; whether he is aware that the order is in contravention of Section 3, Sub-section (5) of the said Act; and whether he will have the order at once withdrawn.

MR. CHERRY (for Mr. BIRRELL): The hon. Member refers to a circular letter which has been sent to petty sessions clerks calling attention to the law as to the disposal of fines imposed under the Irish Education Act, 1892. The Government are advised that the subsection quoted in the Question merely provides for the application of the proportion of the fines under the Education Act which is awarded to local authorities, and does not contain a direction that the entire amount of fines under the Act is to be paid to such authorities. Consequently the application of penalties under the Act is governed by the Fines Act, 1851, which provides that one-third of any fine may be paid to the prosecutor.

### Sligo County Council Printing Contract.

MR. LIDDELL (Down, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state the name of the person or firm carrying out the printing contract of the Sligo County Council; whether he is aware that the tender given to a Mrs. M'Hugh has been found void by Major Eccles, the Government auditor; that this tender was £399 per annum for three years, and that the lowest tender was £216 13s. 4d. per annum; whether he is aware that this lowest tender was stated to have been refused for the reason that it was the rule of the Sligo County Council that all its printing should be done in Sligo, and that the secretary to the Sligo County Council admitted to Major Eccles that a considerable portion of the accepted contract was executed in Dublin; whether he will take steps to secure that the Irish council which the Government propose to set up shall not have power to give contracts to persons for political purposes; and will he say how much money has been paid by the Sligo County Council to Mrs. M'Hugh in respect of the printing tender of £399 per annum.

MR. CHERRY (for Mr. BIRRELL): I am informed that the King's Bench Division of the High Court has issued a conditional order of *certiorari* to bring up for review the decision of the Local Government Board's auditor in this case. As the proceedings are pending, it does not seem desirable to enter into details of the case.

### Ireland and the Budget Surplus.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the admitted claims of primary education in Ireland, he can see his way to using portion of the present surplus at his disposal for meeting these claims during the present year; whether portion of that surplus is, as a matter of fact, due to Ireland; and whether he will consider the advisability of using such portion for meeting Irish claims of a pressing nature rather than in conserving it in connection with proposals that in all probability will not affect Ireland in the future.

MR. ASQUITH: I cannot reopen the question of the provision to be made for Irish primary education for the current year, which was carefully considered when the Estimate now before the House was framed, while I have already dealt with the disposal of the estimated surplus in my Budget proposals. I believe that Ireland will in the future benefit at least proportionally with the other parts of the United Kingdom, as a result of the manner in which I propose to deal with the surplus.

### Irish Postal Stores Branch.

MR. MEAGHER: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is with his cognisance that applications are being invited from officers serving on the London staff of the Controller of Stores for transfer to the new stores branch in Ireland, although no similar invitation appears to have been extended to the officers serving in the Irish stores branches that have been abolished; and will he, in deference to Irish opinion on the subject, abolish the present system of requiring Irish contractors desirous of quoting for engineering stores required in Ireland to tender for delivery in London instead of in Ireland, where the stores are used.

I beg also to ask the Postmaster-General whether at a conference held in March last between the engineer-in-chief to the Post Office, the Controller of Stores, and the superintending engineers in Ireland, it was decided that the stores branch of the engineering department would be taken over by the Controller of Stores, and that the clerks hitherto performing the work in the Irish districts would not be allowed the opportunity of following the work to the Controller of Stores staff; and will he say whether applications from the Irish clerks for transfer have been refused consideration by the engineer-in-chief, and, if so, on what grounds; and whether effect has yet been given to the promise that due regard would be given to the claims of the existing staff.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The transfer of the work of telegraph storekeeping in Ireland from the superintending engineers to the Controller of Stores was sanctioned by me for administrative reasons. The details of the scheme including the selection of the staff required are now being settled, and I can only repeat the assurance that I have already given in reply to another hon. Member, that the claims of all officers affected will receive due consideration. With regard to the second part of the Question. In cases where Ireland is known to be the destination of the stores, contractors would be asked to tender for direct delivery there; but in most cases it is impossible to say beforehand where particular stores will be required.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked as to the business for Wednesday and Thursday.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) said that after the Budget was finished on Wednesday, it was proposed to take the Post Office Sites Bill, the Butter Bill, and the Criminal Appeal Bill, in that order. Vote 3 of the Revenue Department (the Post Office Vote) would be the Supply for Thursday.

## *NEW BILLS.*

### REFORMATORY AND INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend the Law as to Reformatory and Industrial Schools," presented by Mr. George Greenwood; supported by Sir John Kennaway, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Gooch, and Mr. Nicholson; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 179.]

### FRUIT GROWERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law with respect to the classification of Fruit Growers Holdings in Scotland for purposes of rating; to include certain sections of the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1906; and for other purposes in respect of these holdings," presented by Mr. Menzies; supported by Mr. Molteno, Mr. Gulland, Major McMicking, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Beale, Mr. Dundas White, and Sir Thomas Glen Coats; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 180.]

### SHOPS (No 3) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Shops," presented by Sir Charles Dilke; supported by Mr. Bowerman, Mr. Timothy Davies, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Mr McCrae, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Alfred Scott, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Seddon, Mr. Tennant, and Mr. Wedgwood; to be read a second time upon Friday, 24th May, and to be printed. [Bill 181.]

### PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

Ordered, that Mr. Harold Cox be discharged from the Select Committee on Parliamentary Debates.

Ordered, that Mr. Theodore Taylor be added to the Committee.—(*Mr. Whiteley*).

### IRISH COUNCIL.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.), in asking leave to bring in a Bill to provide for the establishment and functions of an administrative council in Ireland, and for other purposes connected therewith, said: When I call to mind the great occasions within the memory of so many of us when an illustrious man, a famous Prime Minister, and a consummate orator, standing at this Table, unfolded to the House, and to the country, and to the world, his scheme for the better government of Ireland, I am more thankful than I can say, for purely personal reasons, that my task this afternoon is one of far humbler dimensions, and, therefore, I need not add, more commensurate to my position and my powers. But when the Bill I am now asking leave to introduce has been propounded and published, it will be scanned and scrutinised, not only by every Member of both Houses of Parliament, but by every class of political critic, and particularly by Irishmen and Irishwomen, not only in Ireland, but all through that great and famous Empire in the building up and maintaining of which men of the Irish race have played so conspicuous a part. When that Bill comes to be scanned and scrutinised line by line, and, it may be, letter by letter, it will be found that it does not contain a touch or a trace, a hint or a suggestion, of any new legislative power or authority. No law, public or private, can ever be made at any time, or in any circumstances, by virtue of any one of its provisions. It does not authorise the levying of a single tax or the striking of the humblest rate. This Imperial Chamber of which we are so proud—a pride I am bound to say which does not seem quite commensurate with the amount of work which its habits and customs permit it to do—nevertheless, we are proud of it with all its faults—will remain majestically unaffected by the provisions of this Bill. Our friends from Ireland, in undiminished numbers, will still continue to foregather with us, and, though I hope their inquisitiveness will be directed in another and better constructed channel, they will still participate in our debates, and will have, I doubt not, their usual almost diabolical good luck in the Parliamentary ballot on Private Members' nights.

But though the Bill is thus limited in its scope, it will be found to be well defined as to the sphere of its operations. It has, as its reason for existence, an object the almost supreme importance of which will be called into question by nobody, sit where he may, in this House, and least of all by any person, who, like myself, has been summoned by the mysterious but by no means divine call of our in-and-out system of Party government to be responsible for the administration of the law in Ireland. That object has often been expressed before. The language may perhaps sound in some ears somewhat hackneyed, but it is language, I submit to this House, of the utmost gravity. That object, I say, is the association of the sentiment of the Irish people as a whole with the administration of the numerous statutes, rules, and regulations which direct the conduct of purely Irish affairs within Ireland herself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the making of laws is one thing, their daily administration amongst the people for whose benefit they are intended is quite another. Over their law-makers the people of Ireland have now had for some considerable time some considerable measure of control. By what method they obtained that control I would not now stop to inquire. But when once these laws have been made and have crossed the Channel, they pass away out of the control of the Irish people, who are not, as it were, the lawful consignees to whom alone delivery can properly be effected. No, the consignees of those laws that we make within these walls are not the Irish people, but the officials belonging to a system which is called, more conveniently than accurately, Dublin Castle. Some of those officials are under the control, so far as it is a real control, of the Chief Secretary for the time being. Others are wholly independent of him. Some of the Irish Departments are wholly on the Votes, others are partly on the Votes, and have endowments of their own. The Board of Intermediate Education, as some Irish Members lately discovered—though I should have thought they might have known it before—is not on the Votes at all, but lives entirely on its own resources, beyond the reach of either the Chief Secretary or the House of Commons. But, whether these offices are on the Votes or not, I am sure I shall carry with me, at all events, the Scottish and the Irish Members, when I say that the allotted days of Supply as an effective means of Parliamentary criticism and control are a mockery and a delusion. I do not add a snare, because they have long ceased to take anybody in. For the purpose of to-night I shall assume that what is called, though inaccurately, Dublin Castle administration is a failure. I have been supplied by a zealous friend, who in this matter of speech-making is, I think, to use Wordsworth's expression, "something betwixt a hindrance and a help," with a sheaf of quotations from distinguished politicians living and dead, belonging mostly to the Unionist side of politics, all criticising somewhat harshly what is called Dublin Castle administration. I read these quotations, I admit, with a lack-lustre eye. There are fifty-one pages of them, and although carefully indexed, I cannot say they have afforded me very profitable study. They differ very much in ferocity, according to the temperament of the speaker, the period of his political development, the occasion of the delivery of the speech, and, I daresay, sometimes the place of delivery; and although they all of them breathe the spirit of freedom and liberty, with which I greatly sympathise, many of them are not sufficiently informed with an accurate appreciation of the true facts of the case as to justify me in inflicting them on the House. But there are three short quotations, and three only, which I think

I should like to make, and the dignity of the occasion perhaps demands that I should do so. Two are from the speeches of that famous man, who was for long and difficult years the Leader, and, as some think, the reconstructor, of the Tory Party, and the rays of whose illuminating discourse cast even over the dreary pages of *Hansard*, which he himself has called the Dunciad of politics—make even these volumes occasionally worthy of perusal. Mr. Disraeli, speaking in this House in 1844—a long time ago, but then time does not count for much in the history of Ireland—said—

> "I always thought that the greatest cause of misery in Ireland was identity of institutions with England. It has become a great historical aphorism that Ireland is to be the great difficulty of the Minister. Now this is an opinion in which I never shared. I never believed that Ireland would be a great difficulty, because I feel certain that a Minister of great ability and of great power would, when he found himself at the head of a great majority, settle that question. What, then, is the duty of the English Minister? To effect by his policy all those changes which a revolution would do by force. That is the Irish question in its integrity. It is quite evident that to effect this we must have an executive in Ireland which shall bear a much nearer relation to the leading parties and characters of the country than it does at present."

Then he adds characteristically enough—

> "I beg distinctly to say I never changed my principles on Irish policy, or in any other respect."

That is in 1844—

> "I say this without reservation. At no time, at no place, in no circumstances, have I ever professed any other principles than I now profess. They are Tory principles, the only principles of the democracy of England."

In 1868 Mr. Disraeli was challenged in this House with the use of these words, and I agree that the Disraeli of 1868 was a different one from the Disraeli of 1844; and how did he defend himself?—

> "With reference to the passage which has been quoted from a speech made by me, I may remark that it appeared to me at the time I made it that nobody listened to it. It seemed to me I was pouring water upon sand, but it seems now that the water came from a golden goblet. With regard to the passage from that speech, there are many remarks which, if I wanted to convince, I might legitimately make, but I do not care to, and I do not wish to, because in my historical conscience the sentiment of that speech was right. It may have been expressed with that heedless rhetoric which I believe is the appanage of all who sit below the gangway; but in my historical conscience the sentiment of that speech was right."

The third quotation, and the last, is from a living statesman, of great authority, whom, though a free trader, tariff reformers will, I am sure, listen to with respect, and who, though a Unionist, can always secure a patient and attentive hearing from any audience of Home Rulers; I mean the Duke of Devonshire. The Duke, speaking in Belfast as long ago as November 5th, 1885, said as follows—

> "I believe that the Irish Government, the structure of the Irish Government, the system of the Irish Government has been most unjustly assailed, and I believe that it is not responsible for many of the sins which have been laid to its charge; but at the same time I am perfectly willing to admit that it is very possible, and even probable, that the Irish Government as now constituted is not the best fitted in all respects to discharge all the functions which it has now to discharge, still less"—

and I ask attention to this—

> "to undertake new and more important duties. I would not shrink from a great and bold reconstruction of Irish Government. I would not be disposed to deny it is probable that at present it is too centralised in Dublin, and that owing to the delegation of so many of the functions of Government to responsible boards it is wanting in vigour and responsibility. I would not shrink from a bold reconstruction of the Government of Ireland; but I maintain that as Ireland stands to-day the Executive Government must retain considerable power over any local boards which may hereafter be created, and I would endeavour so to frame those powers as to make them capable of relaxation, perhaps ultimately of relinquishment, in response to any proof we may receive from the Irish people of their fitness for self-government, their fitness for the assumption of those responsibilities."

It is at all events in the spirit of those quotations that His Majesty's Government have approached the solution or partial solution of this still unsettled problem. I will labour the point no further. If anybody here believes that the present system of administration of Irish affairs is sound and sensible, that it is a system likely to train the Irish people in the habits of self-respect and economy, I must wait to see how that individual seeks to make out his case. I hope I need not say I bring no accusation whatsoever against Dublin Castle or against Irish officials. Language of praise from one who has been such a short time in his office would be fulsome, and language of censure would be impertinent. For one or two officials with whom I have been brought into close personal contact I already entertain a feeling of respect which I doubt not under favourable circumstances might ripen into affection, and I do not think that any Chief Secretary, with the slightest tincture of popular feeling in his bone, can enter the gloomy portals of Dublin Castle without a sinking of the heart almost amounting to an abandonment of hope. It is not that Dublin Castle is a sink or seat of jobbery and corruption. It may have been so once. It certainly is so no longer. But it is, to use a familiar expression, "switched off" from the current of national life and feeling; and one cannot feel—I do not believe anybody within the walls of Dublin Castle can feel—that that is the way to secure the regeneration of Ireland. No pulse of real life runs through the place. The main current of Irish life as it rushes past its walls passes by almost unheeded. There it stands, "remote, unfriended, melancholy, slow," regarding this great stream of national life and feeling with a curious expression, mingled, it may be, with cynicism and amusement, coupled also, I admit, with a passionate tutorial desire to teach the wild Irish people how to behave themselves, just and exactly as the great Roman provincial of *Anno Domini* 120, living in his delightful villa in York, or Colchester, or Bath, may have regarded the vagaries of the then inhabitants of this island.

Well, now the total number of departments, boards and offices, excluding the Admiralty and War Office, engaged in the administration of public business in Ireland is, I believe, a matter of controversy. I have, however, been supplied with a list of forty-five, and they are grouped as follows. Ten come under the full control of the Irish Government, viz., the Royal Irish Constabulary, the Dublin Metropolitan Police, the General Prisons Board, Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Inspectors of Lunatics, General Register Office, the Department of the Registrar of Petty Session Clerks, Resident Magistrates, Crown Solicitors, and Clerks of the Crown and Peace. There are three not so fully controlled by the Irish Government—the Land Commission, the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests, and the Public Records Office. There are five not at all under the control of the Irish Government except as far as regards appointments and the framing of rules—the Board of National Education, the Board of Intermediate Education, the Commissioners of Endowed Schools, the National Gallery, and the Royal Hibernian Academy. Not under the control of the Irish Government, but with the Chief Secretary as president *ex officio*, are the Local Government Board, the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, and the Congested Districts Board. There are four boards exercising statutory powers in Ireland not under Government control—the Public Loan Fund Board, the Commissioners of Irish Lights, the Royal University, and the Queen's Colleges. Eight are not controlled by the Irish Government, and of these the most important are the Supreme Court of Judicature and its offices, the Registry of Deeds, the Local Registration of Titles, and the Railway and Canal Commission. There are English departments working in Ireland not under the control of the Irish Government. There are twelve of these, among them being the Customs and Inland Revenue and the Board of Trade. [An HON. MEMBER: Board of Works.]

Here at all events is a sufficient area of choice, and the question we have to determine is how many of these departments, boards, and bodies should we attempt to place under some kind of real and effective control. Some, of course, for obvious reasons lie altogether without the scope of any such proposals as ours will be found to be, such as the Customs and Inland Revenue and the General Post Office. Nor do we in any way propose to affect the Supreme Court of Judicature and its offices, the Royal Irish Constabulary, the Dublin Metropolitan Police, the Land Commission, and the General Prisons Board—all these and others are left outside the provisions of the Bill. We propose to make the following departments and boards subject to the provisions of this Bill. They are eight in number—the Local Government Board, the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, the Congested Districts Board, the Commissioners of Public Works, the Commissioners of National Education, the Intermediate Education Board, the Inspection of Reformatory and Industrial Schools, and the Registrar-General. By the provisions of the Bill the Lord-Lieutenant, after consultation with the Irish Council, may by Order in Council apply the provisions of the Bill to certain other departments not of an important character. The Irish Lights and the Lunatic Asylums are among the number. But for the purposes of our discussion of this Bill I think we will confine ourselves to the eight named departments which I have just set out. I will say a word or two about each of them.

First, there is the Local Government Board. The Local Government Board is well housed in the old Customs House of Dublin. The Chief Secretary is its *ex officio* president, and Sir Henry Robinson is its exceedingly able vice-president; the Under-Secretary is an *ex officio* member, and there are two other gentlemen. It has no endowments of its own or allocated specially to it, but it now has a Parliamentary Vote amounting to £76,000. In addition to the well-understood duties of the Local Government Board, including Poor Law administration, it has now cast upon it, under the provisions of those very useful Labourers' Cottages Acts, the control and the responsibility of looking after the housing of the labourers in every part of Ireland; and the fund it may be called upon to administer in connection with these Acts may assume—and will assume—very considerable dimensions, much larger than the sum appearing this year in the Vote. It has a large staff of inspectors, general and medical, auditors, clerks in the first and second divisions, and assistants; and perhaps no other office is brought into closer contact with the administration of the law in Ireland than is this Board.

We come now to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland. This important and comparatively well-endowed department was created in 1899 by Act of Parliament, 62 and 63 of the late Queen, chapter 50; and is a very fair specimen of Tory revolution. It transferred the powers and duties found vested in a considerable number of existing departments to a new department which it sought to place under some sort of—I will not say popular—control. The Chief Secretary is the *ex officio* president, but it will be admitted that the scheme of the Bill was that the Vice-President, who was originally, at all events, intended to be a Minister in this House, should do the work of the department with the assistance of the Council of Agriculture, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Technical Instruction. The Council of Agriculture consists of 104 members; sixty-eight are nominated by the county councils, thirty-four are nominated by the department itself, and there are two *ex officio* members. This Council meets once a year—I believe that it has usually met twice—for the purpose of discussing matters of public interest in connection with the purposes of the Act. The Agricultural Board consists of twelve members, eight appointed by the provincial committees of the Council of Agriculture, and four by the department itself. This board meets five or six times in the year, and its business is to advise the department with respect to matters and questions submitted to them by the department in connection with the purposes of agriculture and rural industry. The council discusses, the board advises, and the department does what it thinks best. The Board of Technical Instruction corresponds to the Agricultural Board. It has twenty-one members, mostly appointed by county boroughs and the committees of the four provinces. Its duty is to advise the department on all questions submitted to it by the department in connection with technical instruction. This department is not badly off. It has an annual income of £166,000, apart from its Parliamentary Vote of £178,817. The annual income is derived from grants, from local taxation, and from the Irish Church temporalities, and it has certain capital sums standing to its credit. This department, very properly, employs a large staff in its agricultural branch, its technical instruction branch, its fishery branch, and other services, and it has, undoubtedly, done much good and energetic work under the enthusiastic guidance of Sir Horace Plunkett.

The Congested Districts Board, which comes next, is probably one of the most useful and one of the most popular bodies in Ireland. It came into existence by the Land Purchase Act of 1891. Its duties are so well known that I need not refer to them, but any one who cares to refer to the Land Purchase Act of 1891 will find them stated fully. It has found its way into Irish novels, and a good deal of the good humour often poked at it may be taken as an indication of its good work. I do not think fun of such a good-natured character is ever poked at Dublin Castle. This board has indeed done very good work. Its revenues are made up of £41,000 from the Church temporalities fund, a Parliamentary grant of £25,000, and an equivalent grant of £21,000—in all about £87,000.

The Commissioners of Public Works are a highly criticised body, and I am certain that whoever comes to exercise control over them will find that they have to discharge duties which are certain to be the subject of a great deal of powerful criticism. The Commissioners, under terms of Acts of Parliament, deal with Railway Acts, Marine Works Acts, and, by the direction of the Treasury, with the execution or overlooking of such public works in Ireland as tend to the development of her resources, her trade and industries, and fishing. It has no endowment of its own. It has a Parliamentary Vote, but in effect it does what it is told to do, for it is provided with funds. It frequently, I am sorry to say, comes in collision with other boards. No task is more difficult and none more important than how best to spend whatever money can be obtained for the general development of Ireland. It can only be done by taking wide views and by resisting local pressure — two extraordinarily difficult things for any body of men to do. It may not have the opportunity, the means, or the qualification to take wide views, and the power of resisting local pressure notoriously varies according to individual cases; but I think, as a rule, it may be said that most men do at some time yield to it. In the present scramble for the grants that may be obtained from the Treasury I am sure to find sometimes the height of efficiency and almost the depth of personal degradation; and to be for ever taking precautions to support or to resist particular claims cannot, I am certain, be a pleasant task for any man whatsoever. The Chief Secretary suffers, perhaps, most, but the Irish Members from all parts of Ireland suffer also. They are baffled again and again in their visitations to the Treasury, and I am sure as they return back to the House to write their letters to their constituents they must experience more of that hope deferred which makes the heart sick, and they must have in their minds the substance of the thought, if not the words, of Dante, when he said—

> "How sad a part it is to climb and descend other men's stairs."

We hope by our proposals to lift this great work of Irish development to a position of greater dignity and enable those in authority to arrange the disposition of the money in such a way as will do the greatest possible good to a country which more than any other does stand in need of assistance to build up those trades and industries of a local character which, unfortunately, have been allowed to get into a bad state, and on which the happiness and welfare of the country greatly depend.

As to the Commissioners of National Education, they are incorporated by Royal charter, dated 1845, for administering the fund placed at the disposal of the Lord-Lieutenant for the education of the poor in Ireland. They are twenty in number. They are all unpaid except the resident Commissioner, and they are nominated for life or until resignation by the Lord-Lieutenant, and by an unwritten rule a Roman Catholic succeeds a Roman Catholic and a Protestant a Protestant in unbroken succession, thus maintaining an equal division between the religions. They have no endowment; but they receive from the Votes £1,000,408, and have a development grant of £74,000. There being no education rate in Ireland, these sums, added to by small local contributions for maintaining and repairing school-houses, represent the whole amount spent on primary education in Ireland. These Commissioners naturally employ at their central establishment a large staff of clerks and an army of inspectors.

The Intermediate Education Board consists of twelve Commissioners nominated by the Lord-Lieutenant and two Assistant Commissioners. By means of examination they look after the secondary schools in Ireland. They are independent of Parliamentary criticisms and subsist on an income of £81,000 per annum derived from the interest on Church temporalities and the Local Taxation Account. They have also considerable sums invested, representing accumulated savings. I need not say anything about the Reformatory and Industrial Schools or the Registrar's Office.

Taking, then, these eight departments as marking out and defining the spher f our operations, how do we propose hat they should be placed under the ontrol of the Representative Council? If am asked, "Why a council at all?" I an only reply that in a democratic age, nd in a democratic country, and in this ery democratic House of Commons, the esources of civilisation are somewhat estricted. I remember hearing Mr. Parnell—that unforgettable Parliamen-ary figure—speaking at a memorable neeting of the Eighty Club, when he ad as his fellow guest Lord Spencer, vhose enforced absence from the Councils f the King and from public life I am ure every one without any exception vhatever must deeply deplore—I remem-er hearing Mr. Parnell say that there vere two ways of governing Ireland. ne way he expounded at some length. he other way was to find a man strong nough and stern enough—sufficiently ull of character and resource—who would o over to Ireland and do evenhanded ustice between landlord and tenant, atholic and Protestant, rich and poor. Ir. Parnell said that he had sometimes hought that that was the one way of overning Ireland. It may be said to us, Why, instead of getting up a council to ontrol administrative work, cannot you nd some man of the kind Mr. Parnell ad in his mind, who would go to Ireland nd who would decide by his *ipse dixit* vhat great public work should be under-aken and what should be postponed and vhat should be altogether abandoned? et him decide educational policy, rimary, secondary, and technical, and et him do this work in a spirit of courage, onesty, and independence." Well, His Majesty's Government had no such man n their eye, and I do not think that entlemen opposite could supply our eficiency. For my own part I am xceedingly glad that we have not, for ersonally I would much sooner write the iography of a deceased autocrat than ive under his sway; for the reason that hese men, however great they may be, nd however interesting their biographies may be, do not make good history. We re obliged, therefore, to fall back, and we need not be ashamed of falling back—n the contrary we may glory in it—on a epresentative Assembly. I quite agree hat representative Assemblies have nowa-ays grown somewhat old. The gilt is a ittle rubbed off the gingerbread. Here s the mother of them all, and it would be strange if we were not alive to some of their shortcomings and faults. But all institutions that are meant to be of any good in this workaday world must be content to be tarnished by the world, like the grand old name of "gentleman," which, soiled though it be, still remains a great thing. And representative institutions, though their faults be proved against them as much as you like, still remain the best educational methods of conducting the government of any country.

We propose to establish a Representative Council, an Administrative Representative Council, consisting of eighty-two elected members and of twenty-four nominated members, with the addition of the Under-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant as an *ex officio* member. The elective members of the Council will be elected by the local government electors in the constituencies set out in a schedule to the Bill. That is the same as the Parliamentary franchise, except that it includes peers and women. I should be very sorry if women were not allowed to take part in any good work which may be within the reach of any one in their country. The nominated members are to be nominated by His Majesty during the first term of office. After the expiration of that term they will be nominated by the Lord-Lieutenant. I daresay that if the population difficulties of Ireland were of a different character, and if the population were not segregated as it is, some other method than nomination might be suggested to secure the representation of minorities. But I do not think that, Ireland being as it is, and the population being divided as it is, any system of minority representation would secure to the Protestants of the south and west parts of Ireland any representation whatsoever. Therefore, it is only by the process of nomination that that great object can be properly attained. The President of the Council will be appointed by the Council. The Chief Secretary, though not a member of the Council, and not entitled to vote, shall have the right to be present at the meetings of the Council or of any Committee, and to speak, if so moved, on such occasions.

The question arises now, What are the functions of this Council to be? It is to have control, and complete control, over the exercise of the powers to which the Bill applies—and those are any powers vested at the time of the passing of the Bill in the eight departments which I have mentioned, and also any powers vested in the Lord-Lieutenant or the Chief Secretary at the time of the passing of the Bill relating to those departments, and any powers which may be declared hereafter to be vested in those departments. Therefore the function of the Council is to control the exercise of the powers now vested or hereafter to be vested in the eight departments I have mentioned. The method by which the Council is to exercise those powers is by resolution of the Council itself. The authorities in whom the powers are for the time being vested shall, subject to the provisions of the Bill, act in accordance with the resolutions of the Irish Council in respect of the exercise of those powers, and shall obey any direction given by the Council with respect to the submission of any matter relating to the exercise of these powers of the Council. I want the House to realise the method of proceeding. The powers remain vested in the departments, but the exercise of those powers is to be controlled by resolution of the Council in the manner which I have indicated. The final authority of Parliament is maintained by means of a power which is entrusted to the Lord-Lieutenant of reserving questions for consideration. He may reserve any resolution of the Irish Council, and when he has so reserved that resolution it will not operate until it is confirmed by him. And on the consideration of any resolution so reserved he may either confirm the resolution or he may annul it, or he may remit the matter for further consideration by the Council, together with any expression of opinion he thinks fit to make thereon. If anything more than that is necessary in order to preserve the efficiency of the service or to prevent public or private interests being affected in matters where immediate action may be expected, the Lord-Lieutenant may make such order in respect to the matter as, in his opinion, the necessity of the case may require. That, of course, is Government business. The Lord-Lieutenant will remain, under the provisions of this Bill, a Party officer, and any interference that he feels called upon to make by way of annulling any resolution of the Council will, of course, naturally come under consideration and discussion in this House and will be defended if it requires defence by the Chief Secretary. Therefore, subject and save so far as in the unlikely event of any interference by the Lord-Lieutenant by way of annulling a resolution of the Council—save and so far as that safeguard is created by the Bill, it is intended that the Council shall have full control over the exercise by these departments of their powers.

And it is intended—and the Bill provides for that—to arrange for the exercise of these powers of control by means of committees. The Council will be authorised to establish as many committees as it thinks fit, either of a general or special nature, consisting of such number of persons as it thinks fit, and generally to organise and set up these committees. But there must be a Finance Committee, a Public Works Committee, a Local Government Committee, and an Education Committee. These committees are required to be forthwith set up. Other committees relating to other subjects it is for the Council to determine whether they will have or not, and of what character they are to be. The work of the committees, when they have concluded their investigations of the matter submitted to them by the departments, will come before the Council itself for confirmation or rejection or alteration. Each committee shall have a chairman, who is to be appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant. Now I have to make a distinction between six of the departments and the two educational departments. The six departments we leave alone to exercise their statutory powers, doing their ordinary routine work and generally attending to the business of the office, subject always to the control of the committee and of the Council who are placed over them, and may call upon them to submit whatever matters they think fit, and to come to such decision on each particular case, be it big or be it little, as they think fit. We do not propose to leave the education boards in that position, and we take by this Bill power by Order in Council to constitute a new Education Department; and when that Education Department has been constituted there will be a complete transfer to it of the powers and the funds of the Commissioners, who will be thereupon dissolved. We, therefore, do propose—and this is a part of the Bill to which I personally attach most enormous importance—that there shall be for the first time in Ireland an Education Department, which shall have responsibility for primary and secondary education in that country, and that that department, when it is constituted, will come under the control of this new Council, just in the same manner as the other six departments to which I have alluded. Provision will be made for the payment to the president of the Council and the chairman of any committee of such salaries as the Council themselves may provide.

I think now I should refer to the schedule showing the proposed constituencies which are to elect the eighty-two Members of the Council. They are divided into county boroughs and counties. As to the county boroughs, Dublin will remain with four members in its four divisions. Belfast will have its four Members in its four divisions; Cork will have its two Members as an undivided constituency; and Londonderry, Limerick, and Waterford will have one each as now. Of the counties Antrim will have four Members; Londonderry, 2; Donegal, 4; Tyrone, 4; Down, 4—Newry is deprived of any representation and thrown into the county; Armagh, 3; Cavan, 1 (instead of 2 as in this House); Monaghan, 1; Fermanagh, 1; Dublin, 2; Wicklow, 1; Wexford, 2; Carlow, 1; Kilkenny (with the city), 1; Kildare, 1; Queen's, 1; King's, 1; Louth, 1; Meath, 1; Westmeath, 1; Longford, 1; Cork, 7; Kerry, 2 (instead of 4); Limerick, 2; Clare, 2; Tipperary, 4; Waterford, 1; Mayo, 4; Galway (with the city), 4; Sligo, 2; Roscommon, 2; Leitrim, 1. That makes eighty-two elected Members; add to this twenty-four nominated Members and one *ex officio* Member and you have a total of 107. I do not think, having regard to the number of committees that will probably be found necessary to manage this difficult business—and the considerable size which the Education Committee, for example, will have to be—I do not think that is too large a body to place at the disposal of the country the services of men of business whom we hope to see sitting upon it. With regard to the Education Committee, we propose that the Lord-Lieutenant shall have power on that committee to appoint persons having experience in education, not being members of the Council, to be additional members of the Education Committee, the number so appointed not to exceed one-fourth of the whole number of the members of the committee; and women may be appointed as additional members of the Education Committee. I do not think that the 107 is at all too large a body to supply the necessary material to discharge the very important duties that will be imposed upon them.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): For what period will they be elected?

MR. BIRRELL: For three years.

I now pass on to the very important subject of ways and means. We propose to establish a separate fund for the purposes of this Act, to be called the Irish Fund, and all payments to that fund shall be paid to the credit of the account of that fund at the Bank of Ireland or at such other bank as the Irish Council shall determine. We propose to constitute by Order in Council an Irish Treasury, having at its head a Treasurer for Ireland. Now in order to feed this Irish Fund, our proposal is to charge on the Consolidated Fund and to pay into the Irish Fund, for the general purposes of this Act, certain annual sums to be fixed by Parliament afresh every five years. A less period can, I think, hardly be thought of as possible, nor would a longer period, I think, be found to be practicable, certainly not to be advisable. The quinquennial period seems to us, after consideration and discussion with persons in Ireland connected with our offices, to be the best period that we can suggest to the House. What is that sum to be for the first period of five years? The present cost of administering the services covered by these eight departments is a little over two millions. Now, there is no single man, however stern and strong and Parnellian he may be, and certainly no body of men, unless they were wholly bereft of their senses, who would consent to take over these eight departments at that figure. To do so would be to plunge into a sea of troubles, and without the faintest prospect of doing any real good work either for Ireland or for one's own reputation. Think, for example, of the Education Committee responsible to Ireland, face to face with the Irish teachers, face to face with the condition of the school buildings—the thing is perfectly unthinkable. Think also of the Committee of Public Works charged with the development of the railways, the harbours, and the fisheries of Ireland. They cannot spend their time rattling at the doors of the Treasury in the way I have described; they must be supplied with funds either to spend or to lend or to accumulate to provide for great schemes of arterial drainage or the like, as in their interest and common sense they think best; and therefore we may be perfectly certain of this, that it will be hopelessly impossible to induce any Council, or any body of men—it ought to be impossible for us to allow ourselves—to go along endeavouring to do the work we all desire to see done in Ireland, both with regard to the improvement of its education and the development of its resources, without a considerable increase of the funds to be placed at the disposal of the Irish people. We therefore, in addition to, or in excess of, the £2,000,000, propose a sum of £650,000 a year. This sum, although it has been carefully considered, is not intended to be taken as based upon an exact Estimate. It is based upon a general view of the state of certain Irish services, and of the certain needs of those Departments during the next five years. I hope to hear that amount criticised. Whether we shall be told it is too large, I wait to hear. I do not desire to express any opinion adverse to the Treasury on the matter. They have treated me with great kindness and consideration in all my communications with them, but I am certainly prepared most actively to maintain that it is not one penny too much. This excess sum of £650,000 per annum, which I name at once in order that it may be in the minds of hon. Members as part of the finance of the transaction, is to be treated separately in the Bill. £300,000 a year, a part of the £650,000, is intended to provide capital for the purpose of public works and the general development of Ireland. That distinction, which everybody must see, ought to be struck between the natural annual out-goings in connection with any particular Departments, and that kind of capital expenditure on enduring works which are not happily of annual recurrence. We, therefore, propose to carry £300,000 per annum, although this is all part of the Irish Fund, to a particular account called a Public Works Grant.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): Is that in substitution of the existing system of loans, or in addition to it?

MR. BIRRELL: Well, the statutory powers are not to be affected. In that sense it will be an additional grant of £300,000 a year for the purposes of this particular work. It is not substituted for any statutory obligation, and, therefore, so far as it is discretionary with the Treasury it may be additional. We intend this to be paid every year for the purpose of providing the new Council with a sum on which, if they like, they can borrow, and obtain advantages, being a certain sum which they will receive each year during the five years. Another portion of the £650,000, about £114,000, when you come to investigate it——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am sorry to interrupt, but this is so important that I want to clear the matter up. At present, as the House is aware, there are sums lent to Ireland by leave of the Treasury to the Public Works Loans Department. I want to know whether this grant, of which the right hon. Gentleman is speaking, is in substitution for these loans, or in addition to it.

MR. BIRRELL: If I have not been understood, I dare say it is my fault. In effect it is an addition. I say there is £114,000 which is also intended for expenditure that is in the nature of capital expenditure—for example, school buildings. We proposed, as the House may remember, £40,000 a year before we entered into this particular proposal for a period of three years for the purpose of school buildings. That is the kind of expenditure we have in our minds when we say that this £114,000 will partake of the nature of capital expenditure, and will not be annual expenditure in the ordinary sense. We, therefore, have these two sums, £300,000 and £114,000, which leave a sum of about £236,000 per annum to assist in providing for the general purposes of administration of the Departments under the Council, including the Irish Treasury. These three sums of

£300,000, £114,000, and £236,000 make up the £650,000, which is the excess sum over and above the £2,000,000 which is the present cost of running these Departments. These sums will altogether constitute the Irish Fund plus the £1,450,000 of local grants. That is allocated by statute to particular purposes—county councils and other bodies that will be in no way affected by it. These sums, £2,000,000, £236,000, and £1,450,000, make up a sum of £3,700,000. If you add to that the public works grant of £300,000 and the supplementary grant of £114,000 you get a sum of over £4,000,000. That will constitute, as a whole, the Irish Fund, which would be the guarantee fund in substitution for the existing guarantee fund. We, of course, propose that those funds constituting the Irish Fund are paid, in the manner I have already described, into the Irish Bank, and all expenses of the Irish Council and all expenses incidental to the powers of those eight Departments otherwise incurred in the execution of the Act are paid out of the Irish Fund, and Parliament is released of any obligation to provide for these expenses otherwise than by means of payments directly to be made to the Irish Fund. It is provided that it shall be the duty of any Department or authority to whom this Act applies to prepare every financial year, with respect to those Boards, estimates in the manner with which we are familiar, under such headings as may be determined by the Irish Council. These estimates, when prepared, will be referred to the Finance Committee under the Irish Act, and after they have been considered by the Committee, the Council must by resolution appropriate the actual sum to be expended under that head. We provide, of course, for an audit of the funds by the Comptroller and Auditor-General under Section 33 of the Exchequer and Audit Act, 1866. We impose necessarily—having regard to the quinquennial character of the grant—certain restrictions. I do not know that I can usefully add more on the subject of finance. It is a little difficult to explain, but I hope I have made it plain that there is to be this Irish Fund, of what the Irish Fund is to consist, that the new money over and above the £2,000,000 is to be £650,000 a year, and that that sum is to be divided, in a manner which I have described, into what roughly may be called capital and income, in order to meet the purposes to which it is appropriated.

Before, however, I can entirely leave the subject of finance I must refer to a question which has arisen under the Land Purchase Act. A little cloud, already bigger a good deal than a man's hand, has arisen over the horizon in respect of that land finance, and I should like to state shortly what the position is in regard to that. Under the Act of 1903, the landlords are paid, not in stock, but in cash, and in order to get the cash wherewith to pay them you have to go to the investing public and induce them to buy your land stock. This is a most excellent security. It yields 2¾ per cent. and the capital is payable at par at the end of thirty years, and why there should be any shyness on the part of investors in investing their money is not for me to say. But the fact is that at present for every £100 of stock to be raised in order to get the funds wherewith to pay the landlords we only get £85. That involves an annual loss spread over the whole of sixty-eight and a half years of £4,000 for every million of money. Under the Act such a loss is thrown upon the Irish Development Grant. Everybody has heard of the Irish Development Grant, although few ever realise the number of things cast upon it. It has been a most useful beast of burden, but I am afraid that, not immediately, but at no great distance of time it must die, by the roadside, so many burdens have been placed upon it. It is at present a Fund of £185,000 a year; £20,000 goes to the Congested Districts Board; £5,000 to Trinity College, Dublin, reducing it to £160,000 a year. Other burdens have been cast upon it in respect of education and the like, but it is practically the Fund on which we depend to meet this loss. The loss already on the appropriation of stock is £70,000 a year, and that the Irish Development Grant still has to bear. If during five years the Irish Land Stock was to issue at the rate of £6,000,000 a year that would mean a sum of £30,000,000 and £4,000 for every million would be the loss to be borne by the Irish Development Grant. This Irish Development Grant is, therefore, in a very parlous state. What comes after the Irish Development Grant? The ratepayers of Ireland. Upon the Guarantee Fund there are certain local demands, such as workhouse doctors, masters and mistresses, payment for pauper lunatics, and district asylums of Ireland, and the Irish people are naturally agitated because they see nothing between them and an enormous burden upon their rates, except this rapidly depleting Irish Development Grant. They naturally ask what is going to be done. That, after all, is still *in futuro*, because the Irish Development Grant is not dead yet and may last three or four years, even if the loss on flotation continues as great as it is. The present loss has been thrown upon it in respect of something which is not in their Irish Development Grant, namely, the advantageous terms offered to people to induce them to take up this stock. Stock applied for in March, although payable by instalments up to June, bears six months interest to its holders, as if they were in the concern for the whole six months. Somebody has got to pay for that, and that loss has amounted to £73,000 in two years. Unfortunately, this was not discovered until the end of the second year; so that this accumulated loss of £73,000 has suddenly been thrown upon the Irish counties. That is a condition of things which requires careful consideration, and the Treasury are considering means by which they may, if possible, prevent this loss on the issue of every £1,000,000 of land stock. At present, however, all we can say to Ireland is that the Irish Development Grant will last as the main fund liable to pay these capital losses on flotation for, at all events, three years; and we are going to throw on the Irish Development Grant the losses, representing £73,000, occasioned by the methods adopted to induce the public to take these shares. In the opinion of the law officers, they could not be properly charged on the Irish Development Grant as it stands, and we are taking power to do that. Therefore the immediate loss to the Irish ratepayer will no longer fall upon him, and the prospective loss will not appear for two or three years, during which time the Exchequer confidently expect they will be able to devise some plan or scheme by which this nightmare may be taken off the minds of the ratepapers. It is a nightmare of a very serious character, because, if these losses were really to fall on the Irish ratepayer, it would be a blow to the system of land purchase which it would probably not be able to stand; and God forbid that anything should happen to interfere with the transfer of the land under the terms of that or some modified measure.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the actual loss of £73,000 which has been deducted from the grant due to the county councils of Ireland will be provided for and repaid to the Irish Development Grant account?

MR. BIRRELL: I am not in a position to make that statement. The provisions of the Bill relate only to future losses and not to the losses which have already been paid by the county councils.

There are only two other provisions of the Bill to which I wish to call attention. One is that we make use of this occasion to get rid of a doubt which exists in some people's minds as to whether the office of Lord-Lieutenant can be held without reference to religious belief. The Bill provides that, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any other Act, every subject of His Majesty shall be qualified to hold the office of Lord-Lieutenant without reference to his religious belief; and in the same way there is a clause which provides that in the exercise of any powers to which this Act applies no preference shall be shown to any religious denomination, and any act or thing done, so far as it gives any such preference, shall be declared invalid. Any question involving a contravention of the Act is to be brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council within one year, and the Committee shall determine the question, and their decision shall be final.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Who is to appoint the officials of the departments controlled by this Council?

MR. BIRRELL: The power to appoint or remove officers to whom the Act applies is a power which is deemed and intended to be a power within this Act, and, therefore, it will be a power exercised by the Council. We have provided in the fullest possible way to save the rights of all existing servants in the same way as, I believe, has been done in previous measures—that is to say, that existing officers, if they give six months notice of their intention to retire, or are required to retire, shall be entitled to receive such payment out of the Irish Fund as the Lord-Lieutenant may award. Our object is to secure in every possible way the rights of existing officers with regard to their pensions.

I do not know exactly, of course, what line of objection will be taken to this measure, but I do not see how any assembly of a democratic character can reject it unless it is honestly and deliberately satisfied that the majority of the Irish people are unfit to exercise any real control over their own Local Government Board, their Department of Agriculture, their Public Works Department, and the education of their children. If you say that the control exercised by this House is sufficient, I admit you will have an answer to this Bill; but nobody does say that of the government of Ireland as at present carried on under these boards and departments that can honestly and truthfully be said. It is part of the case that I assumed at the beginning of my speech that the present administration—what is called Dublin Castle administration—cannot be defended. Now, if we are told, as I dare say we may be, that Protestants under this Bill will have no chance of employment, I shall wait with some curiosity to see how that argument is developed. Ireland is an overwhelmingly Roman Catholic country. It is not very surprising to find that in the county and borough councils there are 1,023 Catholic councillors as against 262 Protestants. If you look at the matter by provinces you find that in Ulster the Protestants are slightly over-represented and in the Catholic provinces you will find the Catholics also—not much, not materially, but slightly over-represented. The fact is you can hardly help that being so. So far as the election of county councillors is concerned, if that is to be any guide in the matter, you will find that what has happened in Ireland is just what would happen in any country whatever. It is not easy for a Roman Catholic to find his way into this House on either side excepting he comes from Ireland. I regret it should be so, and I do not understand why it should be; so but I do not see why we should expect other people to exhibit a greater amount of liberality than we do ourselves. I do not think also that much should be made, or will be made by people who are really cognisant with Ireland, of the inability of people to get employment if they do not happen to profess the faith of the prevailing majority. I am aware that there are complaints both among Catholics in Protestant parts of Ireland and among Protestants in Catholic parts, but I do not think that on close investigation they will be found to amount to very much, and I shall be very much surprised if any one acquainted with the conditions of Kerry or Limerick will assert that in those counties no Protestant need apply, and refuse to the Irish people these very limited rights of being trained in the habits of self-government simply because there is a population of 3,388,000 Roman Catholics as against 1,150,000 Protestants. Surely you are not going to deny to the people this valuable opportunity of education in the habits of dignity, self-restraint, and self-government simply because by an overwhelming majority they belong to one particular faith?

I dare say we shall be told that this Bill paves the way to Home Rule. If the proposals contained in this Bill become law and obtain a fair trial, if the new Council after some years is a success, why, then, I dare say it may pave the way to Home Rule. If, on the other hand, it is a failure, it appears to me that it would present a very considerable obstacle to persuading the electors in this country, who have been called the predominant partners, to accept Home Rule. But surely it is not going to be contended—I know it will not be contended—that the Irish people are to be refused the opportunity of getting the training they require in the exercise of the rights they ought to have in the control of their own country—you, the Unionist Party, cannot refuse those rights on the ground that if they avail themselves of them and prove themselves fit to have Home Rule, one of the difficulties in the way of Home Rule will be removed. You cannot want to keep the Irish people in a state of chronic poverty and disease. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh" and "Shame."] If hon. Gentlemen will read the medical reports they will discover that tubercular disease is making very great progress among the Irish people, and one of the first needs of any Irish Government is to deal with that question promptly. Therefore, I say I am perfectly justified in saying it cannot be argued that the Irish people are to be denied the right of showing themselves fit for self-government, simply because if they show that they are fit, the English people may be disposed, some day or other, to give way to their demand for it. That would be a shocking and terrible doctrine, and I am quite sure it is not the doctrine of the Party opposite. The Unionists of Ireland, Protestants as the majority are, love their country as much as any men can do, although they know it will remain, probably for ever, a Roman Catholic country; and I cannot believe they will deliberately refuse any well reasoned way whereby the wealth and prosperity of the Irish people can be increased and their chances of growing in those habits of self-respect, dignity, and self-restraint, which we all long to see them possess, promoted. I am satisfied that when that is put before them their objections to this measure will prove unjustifiable, and they will, after full consideration, not stand in the way between Ireland and the great advantages offered to her by these proposals. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the Establishment and Functions of an Administrative Council in Ireland; and for other purposes connected therewith."—(*Mr. Birrell.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Although the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has displayed in the speech to which we have listened the familiar qualities of lucidity, humour, and eloquence to which we are accustomed when he rises to address us, I confess that he has not left upon my mind the impression that the plan he has laid before the House is one that even he himself takes seriously. After having listened to all he has had to say as to its character and as to its object, it must surely be evident to every one that there is no object which we ought to desire or which any of us do desire in connection with the government of Ireland which would be furthered by the extraordinary proposals to which we have just listened. The right hon. Gentleman began, naturally enough, by giving us an account of the enormous chaos and complication, as he called it, of the Irish Boards.

MR. BIRRELL: I did not say chaos.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I rather understood that it was this enormous number of Boards under nobody's control which was one of the reasons which influenced the right hon. Gentleman. If in introducing the word "chaos" I have exceeded his meaning, I regret it. If the evil of Ireland is that it has so many separate boards, why has the right hon. Gentleman only dealt with the number which he has? In view of all the evils inseparable from boards in Ireland—not inseparable apparently from boards in England or Scotland; indeed, two new boards are about to be established in Scotland—why is it that out of the forty-seven boards with which the right hon. Gentleman might have dealt he has left thirty-eight undealt with, absolutely untouched, absolutely unmentioned except in the exordium of his speech? All this talk about the character of Irish Government is really based for the most part upon prejudice or ignorance of the working of the institution. Hon. Gentleman below the gangway object to the way it has worked; but I do not think any serious critic says the machine itself is an unworkable machine. Partly because one of the domiciles of Irish Government happens to be called a Castle, because it is possible for literary orators to talk about its gloomy portals, they raise a sort of prejudice that medieval practices prevail in Dublin Castle, which would never be suggested if it were called by some more prosaic name. When the right hon. Gentleman gave us an eloquent account of how the stream of Irish life flowed by the walls of the Castle leaving it entirely upon one side, I wondered whether anybody with an equal gift of rhetoric with the right hon. Gentleman might from the colonial point of view have described even Downing Street in not dissimilar language, and I would ask whether the Treasury itself is regarded by anybody outside the

Treasury as in the full stream of public life in this country. Is the Treasury sympathetic with every demand made upon it by an anxious population? No, Sir, the Treasury is not always sympathetic. I would seriously suggest that we ought not to use about this much-abused Dublin Castle language which has no better justification than similar language which might be used against offices within 200 yards of where I am speaking, and where, at all events, the right hon. Gentleman paid a most merited tribute both to the purity of that administration and the ability of those who are conducting it. The right hon. Gentleman ended his speech by saying, "Are you going to deny Ireland this boon we offer to her and which is to educate her in self-respect?" If a board representing the county council electors, with a nominated fourth, is necessary to the self-respect of Ireland, I cannot see why it is not necessary for the self-respect of England. I see a great many able administrators before me. I respectfully put to the President of the Local Government Board for England the question whether he thinks his duties of controlling certain administrative functions connected with local bodies in England would be better performed if he ceased to be a servant of this House and became the servant of a body elected by those whom it is his business in certain respects to control? How would the President of the English Local Government Board fare if instead of being dependent for his position on the confidence of this House, which in many respects he possesses, he depended upon the Poplar Board of Guardians? Yet, if I rightly understand the political philosophy of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, his view is that the self-respect of Englishmen, their education in the higher purposes of policy, cannot really be carried out so long as the President of the English Local Government Board is only responsible to this House, and that the President of the Board ought to be made responsible as soon as possible not to this House, but to those whom it is his business to supervise, and in some respect to control. That brings me to the first of three questions. Those three questions are—first, are you going to improve Irish administration by what you are doing; secondly, are you going to relieve this House of any of the labours which the Leader of the Irish Party has so eloquently dilated upon; thirdly, are you going to satisfy either English opinion or Scottish opinion, still more are you going to satisfy Irish opinion by this scheme? I will answer those questions very briefly. You are not going to improve administration, and nobody thinks you can improve it by these methods. What are you going to do? To substitute for the well-tried plan of a permanent official responsible to a Parliamentary official, the plan of an official no longer permanent, I am afraid, an official who is responsible to a committee, then responsible to a semi-elected Assembly, which is responsible to a Lord-Lieutenant, who is responsible to a Cabinet, which is responsible to this House. A more preposterous way of attempting to carry out the local government of a country surely never was conceived. The counties have got practically all that the English counties have got in the way of autonomy. Are you going to improve that system by putting over those counties another body partly elected by the same constituency, partly nominated? The work will no longer be done by the rapid, expeditious, and well-tried method which like wise men you are going to keep in England and Scotland. That you propose to abolish in Ireland, and to substitute this most impossible plan of committees responsible to a body which is itself to have its work surveyed by the Lord-Lieutenant. Let us suppose that in the exercise of these duties it is found that the new body is carrying out a work extremely unpopular in a particular district of Ireland, let us say Ulster, and let us suppose that the police or even the military are required in order to see that the law as interpreted and as carried out by this new hybrid body is really obeyed. It is not a hybrid Council who have the right to send the police, luckily; it is not they who have to send the military, luckily; it is the Lord-Lieutenant. Suppose the Lord-Lieutenant does not agree with the Council, who is going to settle that question? You will have a collision of authorities on this plan which must make your whole scheme break down. Again, who is going to advise the Lord-Lieutenant? You throw upon him a task of enormous difficulty. You leave him a partisan official, you leave him what he is now, a nominee and representative of one of the two great Parties in the State, you tell him that he has to survey and adjudicate upon the resolutions of these committees, of this Assembly. If you give him a staff to enable him to survey these resolutions and form a judgment upon them, you have a double staff. If you make him dependent on a staff nominated by your semi-elected Council, you make him dependent on the advice of those whom he has to criticise. You must give him some independent source of information. What provision do you make for it? If you do make provision for it in your Bill, does it not stand to reason that you are re-duplicating and increasing the complexity of that machinery of government which you say it is your first desire to simplify and make clear? That is not all. You are going to nominate a fourth of this representative Council. The fourth nominated will be nominated by a particular Government of a particular complexion in this country. I hope and believe that those at present in office would be careful that their appointments had not a political complexion, but at all events it is possible they might have a political complexion. The appointments are for three years. Suppose that at the end of the first of those years they go out of office. Their political opponents come in and a new Lord-Lieutenant comes in of entirely different views, answerable to a Cabinet of entirely different views, and supported by a House of Commons of entirely different views. What position is that unfortunate man in, and are you going to improve Irish administration by methods of that kind? How are you going to deal between this Irish Board which has supreme power—which may represent not the majority of the elected body, not the gentlemen below the gangway, not the majority of the people of Ireland, nor the majority of the United Kingdom—and a Lord-Lieutenant who has to carry out his duties to the best of his ability? By having this selected body of a complexion which may be at variance with a Lord-Lieutenant representing the majority of this House you will make administration impossible. This system of checks and counter-checks I do not believe will safeguard anybody's interests, but it will destroy the whole mobility and efficiency of your machine. I do not see that the right hon. Gentleman has made the smallest suggestion in his speech by which the danger I have indicated may be avoided. In the course of his speech the right hon. Gentleman quoted a line of poetry which he applied to Dublin Castle as being "unfriended, melancholy, and slow"; how slow will the new machinery be when a Lord-Lieutenant, hostile to the majority, has complete power to stop the whole machine? I venture to prophesy that, from the administrative point of view, people will look back to the halcyon days when through "the gloomy portals" of Dublin Castle they could see work done, business carried through, executed with regularity and with speed. So much for the first question I put with regard to administrative efficiency. I ask a second question—Is the right hon Gentleman going to relieve this House? I imagine the scheme would relieve us of three days of Irish Estimates, but I am not quite sure.

MR. BIRRELL: The Chief Secretary will remain here to answer on the Estimates of the other departments.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then I do not think it will relieve us at all in the matter of Estimates. So far as legislation is concerned, there will be no relief, because by the hypothesis this new Assembly may be preparing the way for some future legislative body. At Question time the Irish Members will not be allowed to ask Questions affecting any of the eight departments which are taken away from the supervision of this House, and handed over to the relative obscurity of departments of which this House has washed its hands. But Irish Members will still remain good supporters of a Radical Administration, and they will be able to ask questions and raise debates upon any use of the veto by the Lord-Lieutenant, but otherwise their principal functions will be to deal with those Scottish and English affairs exactly analogous in character to those which you are taking away from the purview of this House, but which in the case of England and Scotland you mean to leave within the purview of this House. The 103 Irish Members may come here, and, indeed, ought to, and are expected to, come here to discuss everything connected with England and Scotland analogous to the business which is to be transferred to the new Council; but this House and

English and Scottish Members are not to say a word as to how those functions are carried out on the other side of St. George's Channel by this Council. That, I think, is a grossly unfair arrangement which utterly upsets the balance of power in this House, but does not relieve us of an hour's work, and the labour of Parliament will remain undiminished. Are you going to satisfy Ireland? Will the scheme satisfy the Unionists of Ireland? The right hon. Gentleman read some statistics by which he proved to his own satisfaction that, though there might be a slight over-balance of representation of Protestants in Ulster, and a slight over-balance of representation of Roman Catholics in the rest of Ireland, nevertheless, broadly speaking, politics have not been allowed unduly to interfere with the work of the county councils, and that we might anticipate from this new semi-elected body that in that respect it might be expected to follow the good example which, he thinks, has been set by the county councils. My information wholly differs from that of the right hon Gentleman. It is quite certain that the great leaders of Irish Nationalist opinion have openly avowed the policy that the county councils should be used for Nationalist and political purposes. They have used their immense influence to see that that intention is carried out, and it has been carried out. Do you think this large Council will prove less political, that it will use its power less directly for political objects than the smaller units which it is supposed to supervise? It would be folly to hold out any such expectation. I doubt whether the Irish Nationalists themselves will hold out any such expectation. If they do, I am sure the expectation will be disappointed by the event. As certainly as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, so certainly if you bring into being this semi-elected body, nominally for the purpose of controlling and administering these eight departments, it will be used by those who have the majority in it for political and Nationalist purposes. Then, you may say, if that is so, at all events the scheme will satisfy the Nationalists. If a body is to be created which can be used for political objects, those who are to use the weapon will welcome its being forged by the Government. It is for them to speak upon that point, and I do not presume to anticipate their verdict. But they have over and over again, in unmistakable language, told us that nothing will satisfy them except a representative Assembly in Ireland, to which there shall be an Administration responsible. There is no Administration responsible to this Assembly, and the Assembly is not representative. 80 per cent. are elected, 20 per cent. are not elected. When the right hon. Gentleman, surveying the situation, said that in a democratic age, a democratic country, and a democratic House of Commons, only democratic suggestions could be entertained, I wondered whether he thought a Council in which a fourth of the members were nominated corresponded with his idea of democracy in the sense that that word is used in our daily debates.

MR. BIRRELL: A minority may be representative of a democracy.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite agree that you may conceive a nominated Assembly which may in a real sense be representative, but that is different from a democratically constituted Assembly. I do not know whether a plan by which a fourth of your whole Assembly is not elected, but nominated by the British Cabinet, by the Crown, or the Lord-Lieutenant, on the advice of the British Ministers of the day, who represent the majority in this House and the country, is going to satisfy the Irish Nationalists; but I do know it bears not the smallest resemblance to any plan they have ever advocated, and I am utterly unable to see how by any process of development it is capable of being turned into anything which they have ever contemplated. [MINISTERIAL cheers.] Hon. Gentlemen are evidently under the impression that I have made a slip. I have not made a slip, and they will see exactly what I mean before I have finished my speech. I say it is not capable of development by any legitimate means into anything which hon. Members say they desire. But before I deal with my last topic I must say something about poor England and Scotland in this matter. At present it appears that the government of Ireland, through these eight Departments, is carried on at the cost of over £2,050,000, but the right hon. Gentleman says that this amount must be increased by rather more than a quarter, which would mean £600,000.

That is the price which the English and Scottish taxpayer is expected to pay in order to attain the double object of educating the Irish in habits of self-respect —I think those are the words of the right hon. Gentleman—and of reducing Irish administration to a chaotic and impotent condition. I think that the English and Scottish taxpayers have some reason to complain. They get nothing, and it is not intended that they should, in the way of good administration in Ireland, of relieving the labours of this House, of having satisfied the ultimate Nationalist aspirations; they get nothing, but they have to pay another £650,000. I think that when that grievance is added to the other grievances of which I spoke, under which 103 Irish Members are brought to this House with the power of control over the work done in England and Scotland by the Departments here which correspond to the Irish departments, I think you are asking Scotsmen and Englishmen to pay for something which is of very little value. I said that I could not imagine how this plan was to develop legitimately into anything which would satisfy Irish aspirations. Nor do I see it. How can the Government, who avowedly introduce this plan in order that we may move an important step towards the realisation of Irish aspirations, justify the Bill themselves? I cannot answer the question which I myself put. I believe that if it produces ultimately any movement in this country in favour of Irish Home Rule it will produce it, not because it will be a success, but because it will be a hopeless and complete failure. The only motive which has really moved British Home Rule statesmen to abandon the task of maintaining the Union, which men of all parties up to 1886 thought was part of their political heritage, is the weariness of dealing year after year with this perpetual and perennial Irish problem. I have never underrated the magnitude of that problem. I have never held out to any man, party, or audience the prospect that this problem is one the complete solution of which we shall see in our generation. It is of too old standing; its roots are sunk too deep in the past to hope that anything we can do will do more than alleviate conditions. Work of this nature can only be undertaken when the United Kingdom is not merely constitutionally, but, as regards every section of the population, enthusiastically beloved by its citizens. I have never suggested that that prospect was one immediately before us, and I recognise that British statesmen may well have fainted under the weight of the responsibility which, generation after generation, the Irish problem has placed upon them. It is the weariness of that problem, the fatigue of sustaining the responsibility of which I speak, which has been the great engine for converting Englishmen and Scotsmen, in so far as they are converted, to the policy of Home Rule. If this measure does anything at all to further that end, it will be, not because it diminishes or alleviates, but because it grossly aggravates the difficulty of the problem with which we have to deal, because it will augment the feeling of disgust, because it aggravates the feeling of hopelessness too ready to come over us when the Irish question is mentioned, and it is in that way, and that way only, that it has the smallest chances of leading up to the "larger policy" of which the right hon. Gentleman spoke. At what cost is such a consummation to be attained? Even those hon. Members sitting below the Gangway who desire it can hardly say that the attainment of their most cherished desires should be reached through chaos, confusion, and administrative folly, which is, and must be, the only fruit of this hasty and ill-considered scheme. The scheme satisfies nobody, it endangers great interests, it must hamper administrative action, and, while it imposes a real grievance on England and Scotland, while it will be violently opposed by all those who represent Ulster, it will certainly do nothing legitimately to meet the aspirations so often, so clearly, and so earnestly expressed by those who are sent here from other portions of Ireland.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I do not rise, let me say at once, for the purpose of answering the speech or attempting to answer the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down. I stand at the opposite pole on this matter to him; yet, I must confess, there were some arguments he used of which I, looking at them from the opposite pole, felt the force. Therefore, I do not consider that it would be desirable for me on this occasion to enter into what I may call a debating speech in answer to the point raised by the right hon. Gentleman. I desire to address myself, if the House will give me indulgence for a comparatively short time, to the measure which has been unfolded by the right hon Gentleman, as far as I understand it. My object will be very largely to try and make sure that I understand it, and to be very cautious about making any declaration on any point as to which I am not quite certain I am fully informed. Until the actual Bill of the right hon. Gentleman is in my hands, and until I and my colleagues have had time to consider every portion of that scheme, and to elicit Irish public opinion with reference to it, no one will expect me to offer a deliberate or final judgment. My observations, therefore, with reference to any parts of the scheme must be of a general nature, and of a provisional character. At the same time I think the House of Commons is entitled to hear from us, without unnecessary delay, what the general attitude of the Irish Nationalist Party is towards the scheme as described by the right hon. Gentleman. Well, it is impossible to speak with precision about details before one has had time to consider them, though there are some considerations that I can deal with without any reservation whatever, with perfect frankness, and I hope with perfect precision. My mind, this afternoon, has gone back—as the mind of the right hon. Gentleman who introduced this measure —to those two other occasions when proposals were made for dealing with this Irish problem. In 1886 and 1893 that great statesman, Mr. Gladstone, whose name will be for ever associated with the policy of justice to Ireland, proposed to solve this Irish problem by a full and frank concession of self-government and autonomy to the Irish people. We were asked by him to receive his proposals as a settlement of the demands which we were making, and notwithstanding the fact that there was some strong opinion in Ireland as to certain parts of the scheme, we frankly accepted the proposals. The position to-day is entirely different—not that I think the view of the Government or the Party opposite, speaking of them as a whole, is different from the view entertained by Mr. Gladstone as to the final and only real solution of this problem. What they offer us to-day is not Home Rule; it is not offered to us as Home Rule; it is not offered as a substitute for or an alternative to Home Rule. I suppose it is not necessary for me to say again what I understand by Home Rule. It is known by men of every Party in this House and everybody of all Parties in this country. What we mean by Home Rule is a freely elected Irish Parliament with an executive responsible to it. What we mean by Home Rule is that in the management of all exclusively Irish affairs Irish public opinion shall be as powerful as the public opinion of Canada or Australia is in the management of Canadian or Australian affairs. That is our claim; we rest that claim on historic right, on historic title, but we rest it also on the admitted failure of British government in Ireland for the last 100 years. I say admitted failure. What Unionist or Conservative statesman has gone to Ireland for the last twenty five years to carry out Unionist policy who has not frankly admitted that the state of government in Ireland was injurious to Ireland and impossible to sustain? Why, I myself heard the present Leader of the Unionist Party in the House of Lords declare a few short months ago that the system of government by Dublin Castle was an anachronism and could not continue to exist as it is to-day. What has the history been of your rule? The history of famine, of misery, of insurrection, of depopulation. These are facts that cannot be disputed. There have been three unsuccessful outbreaks of insurrection during that time, there has been one great famine which swept away in one year 1,500,000 of the Irish people by starvation. There have been famines every decade during that period, and depopulation is going on to this very moment, so that in a little over fifty years one half of the population has entirely gone. You may differ from me as to the precise cause of all these things, but you must admit that your rule has not been a success, but a failure. We have always been quite frank in these matters in the House of Commons, and I say that if your rule had been as good in the last 100 years as it has been bad, if it had led to the material advancement of Ireland—as in the case of Egypt—still our claim would have remained, because we stand by the principle enunciated by the Prime Minister himself quite recently, when he said, "good government can never be a substitute for self-government." No man has any doubt what our demand means, and it can only be met by full trust in the Irish people. Your own history proves it. You tried a half-way House in Canada, and you failed. You conceded autonomy to Canada, and you turned that great province into a great united and prosperous nation. The lesson you have learned in Canada you have bettered in Australia. And is there no significance in the presence in England at this moment of General Botha? He is the Prime Minister of a self-governing Transvaal who tells you in his speeches that he, who three or four years ago was your open foe in the field, has to-day become a loyal member of your Empire. Why? Because you have fully trusted him and his people. We maintain that by applying that principle to Ireland, and by applying that principle alone, can this Irish problem be solved. The Government do not offer us such a solution, and the Government do not pretend to do so. If this scheme were offered to us as a scheme of Home Rule, if it were offered as a substitute or an alternative, I should feel it my duty, speaking in the name of my colleagues here, and I think in the name of Irish Nationalists in every part of the world, to reject and repudiate it. So far as I understand this scheme it is a continuation and development of the policy which the Tory Party applied to Ireland in 1898 by the grant of county councils, and that in spite of the fact that Lord Salisbury had declared that it was a greater calamity than Home Rule itself. Under this scheme as proposed there is no legislative power whatever extended to this Council—not even the power of private Bill legislation. Let me say this, I am not in favour of getting maimed and dwarfed legislative powers. I would prefer you should give no legislative power at all by this scheme than give dwarfed, maimed, and limited powers You have given no legislative power, and I say the creation of such a body as this is a continuation and development of the policy of the Tory Party in 1898, and simply gives control to the Irish people over the most important of those irresponsible boards which have become a by-word in this country, and which have for years past been wasting millions of money in a rotten and inefficient system of government. The scheme, moreover, as I understand it, reproduces almost exactly, except in one particular which I will mention, the original scheme for dealing with the Irish problem which was put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. I have heard some people throw doubt upon that. I was myself told I was mistaken in that because that right hon. Gentleman's scheme was a scheme for provincial councils in Ireland. That is not so. I have here a quotation from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in 1885, before Mr. Gladstone introduced his Home Rule Bill. He says—

> "I would concede the widest possible measure of democratic Government to the Irish people. Nearly twelve months ago I prepared a scheme with this object, which in addition to providing for a popular representative authority throughout the country proposed also the establishment of a national legislative council to which might be referred the administration, supervision, and control which are now exercised by some of the Departments in London, and of those Departments in Ireland which are known commonly under the name of Dublin Castle. I proposed to sweep away all the network of boards appointed by the English Government carrying with them the seed of English authority, whose interference produces so much irritation, so much annoyance, and so much injury to Ireland."

That scheme was originally proposed as an answer to our demand for Home Rule, and as such it was promptly rejected. If this scheme were proposed as an answer to our demand for Home Rule, and if we were asked to say any such scheme as this would satisfy our aspirations or meet the necessities of the case, it would meet with precisely the same fate. Let me say that these being our views on the Home Rule problem, we, still as Home Rulers, feel ourselves justified in saying we can, at any rate, look on the provisions of this scheme consistently with the maintenance of those aspirations and those views. I want to apply some tests to this proposal. The first question I have to ask myself is this—does this scheme give a genuine and effective control to Irish public opinion over those matters that are referred to the Council? If not, the scheme is worse than useless. If any such scheme is to have any value at all the control must be genuine. The first question I have to ask is as to the constitution of this Council. I was delighted to hear the Leader of the Opposition championing the democratic principle against the nominated element.

**Mr. A. J. BALFOUR:** The Minister laimed it was democratic, and I said it as undemocratic.

**Mr. JOHN REDMOND:** I did not now the democratic principle had such haughty champion. I do not like the ominative principle. I say with the eader of the Opposition it is quite ndemocratic. I object to the nominated lement on this Council. But when am told that the object the Govern ent had in view in putting that ominated element on the Council was give a somewhat larger represen tion if they can to that small minority Ireland who are suspicious and who tertain fears as to the action of the ajority of their fellow-countrymen, then say I am quite willing to accept this ndemocratic principle, or any other feguard the wit of man can devise, con stent with the ordinary principle of presentative government, which is cessary to show this minority in Ire nd that their fears are groundless. I ave often been accused—indeed, I think was accused in yesterday's London *imes*—of having declared that my policy as to put down the Unionist minority in eland with a strong hand. I have ready explained that in this House. I ever said anything of the kind. On the ntrary, the speech I made was a speech which I stated—and I repeat it here w—that so far as the overwhelming lk of our opponents in Ireland are ncerned, I believe they are honest ponents. I believe their fears are oundless and mistaken, but I believe ey are honest, and there is no length which I am not prepared to go to meet ese fears. Therefore I am prepared to cept and swallow this undemocratic d nominated element, if it is put rward upon this ground by the Gov nment. Of course it will be re diated in the House by hon. Members om a portion of Ulster who say they not want it, and it is no use. The ader of the Opposition spoke of Ulster. e majority of the Members from Ulster e in favour of Home Rule. I am bound say that the more violent of the Ulster presentatives from the other corner of e province who speak in this House do t in my opinion—I say it without the ghtest desire to offend them in any ay—really voice the genuine Unionist inion of the majority of our opponents in Ulster. I believe they voice the opinion of a small minority in the line they take. They probably will repudiate this anti-democratic provision. Still, notwithstanding that, I am prepared to accept it, at any rate, as a pledge of my good faith that I am willing in this Bill, or in any Home Rule Bill which may see the light of day, to agree to any conceivable safeguards in order to show that the desire of the majority of the Irish people is not to oppress or to do wrong to anybody. What control will this Assembly so constituted exercise? Up to a certain point in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman I thought that the control would really be absolute and complete. I thought that the Council through its committees and by its own action would have complete power over the Departments, would have complete power over the officials of the Departments, and would have power over the finances of the Departments; but I confess that a question then arose in my mind about the provision as to reservation by the Lord-Lieutenant. Of course, there must be power of reservation in any Home Rule scheme in the world. There is the power of veto by some responsible person. The Lord-Lieutenant, or the Governor in the case of a colony, must have the power of reservation or veto, and I do not object to the Lord-Lieutenant having the power of reserving these resolutions, of confirming or rescinding them, or of referring them back again to the Assembly. That is quite right; but if I understood the right hon. Gentleman properly there is apparently a proposal to give power to the Lord-Lieutenant to do something entirely different, and that is instead of rescinding or confirming or referring back, of simply filing the resolutions and doing the thing himself in his own way and according to his own pleasure. If so, then undoubtedly the power would rest in the Lord-Lieutenant of interfering with and thwarting every single act, large or small, of this Council. In point of fact, if a hostile Lord-Lieutenant was there, he might, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, stop the entire machine on every resolution come to, and he might do it himself irrespective of the view of the Council. Surely that cannot be the real intention of the Government. If that is their intention, then it destroys the real and genuine character of the power given to this Council. But if that is not their intention, if I have misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman on that point, then I am fain to confess that the Bill apparently does give genuine and complete control over those matters that are referred to the Council. The next test I want to apply is this. Is the scheme for the exercise of these powers by the Council a workable scheme? The Government had before them two models. They had before them what may be called the national or Parliamentary model, and they had the municipal model. The national or Parliamentary model takes the form of Ministers in the Assembly charged with the management of certain Departments and responsible directly to the Assembly. The municipal model, on the other hand, is a series of committees. I am not sure that even the experience of the greater county councils goes entirely to prove that in municipal matters that model is entirely satisfactory. But apparently the Government have halted between the two, because while they say that the work shall be done by committees they create a chairman of each committee, to be nominated by the Crown apparently, who will receive a salary. In the ordinary course of events the chairman of a committee would be in the position of a Minister. The chairman would really exercise over his Department the same kind of control which the Chief Secretary is supposed to exercise, and of course cannot, over the whole of the forty-five boards in Dublin Castle. That is to say, he would really be in the position of a Minister. If so, I submit that to hamper him with a committee is an embarrassment and a mischief. I do not believe in this committee system. I do not believe it is a practical system. It would be far better to have one man, selected as the chairman of these committes are to be selected, to have charge, so far as the Council is concerned, of the working of the Department, and then all these chairmen acting together could form a sort of organic body which would give cohesion, would co-ordinate, and give stability to the whole of the work. I am afraid that the Government seem to have shrunk from that for fear the argument would be used against them that they were really creating a Ministry. I am afraid that in the Bill as it stands they are doing neither the one thing nor the other. They are halting between the two, and therefore I am most doubtful whether this machinery of committees is workable machinery. Of course, if these chairmen of committees are to be appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant on the constitutional principle that they are to be men representing the will for the time being of the majority of the Council, then on that theory no one, I think, would object to the Crown exercising this power. I do not know whether that is the intention of the Government. I do not know whether it is a thing that is going to be put in the Bill at all, but I would like to know what their intention is. On the other hand, if these appointments are to be made by the Lord-Lieutenant quite irrespective of the opinion of the Council, then that is a provision I must enter my protest against. There are to be created apparently two Boards of Education. The primary board and the intermediate board are to be abolished apparently, and one Department is to be put in their place—a Department over which there will be a committee as in the case of all the other Departments, and over which the committee of the Council will have complete power with the reservation I have mentioned. The only difference, apparently, is that on this education committee there are to be some outsiders nominated by the Lord-Lieutenant. I want to ask some questions as to the creation of this Department. Who is to create it? When is it to be created? Is it to be created by the Lord-Lieutenant? If so, is it to be without consultation with the Council? That goes to the very root of the thing. You are giving power to the Council to dismiss officials, safeguarding their rights as to pensions, superannuation, and so forth, but what an absurd thing it would be for you the day before this Bill came into law to create a new Department without consulting public opinion in Ireland at all, without waiting for the Council to express an opinion, and thereby, perhaps, put at the head of the Department, or in a responsible position in the Department, a man whom the Council next day, even though it did cost them a considerable amount of money, would probably dismiss from office. I have to ask, therefore, whether the creation of the Education Department is to be carried out in consultation with the Council. This question of the creation of an Education epartment is a thorny and difficult e. We have been denouncing these minated and irresponsible boards for cades in this House, and whenever Minister stood up and said: "Well, ll you agree to the abolition of these ards and the creation of a Government epartment?" we said, "No, bad and as these boards are, we should prefer em to remain there rather than that ucation should be put under a new epartment responsible to an English ouse of Commons and an English overnment." Therefore, we must look round this project before expressing y decided opinion upon it, and I must k for further information as to how e Department is to be created. The me thing applies to the second Depart- ent, which apparently is to be called e Irish Treasury. I do not know w that is to be appointed, and al- ost the same considerations apply to it. ow I come to the most serious of all e tests that must be applied to this easure, namely, is the finance of this easure just to Ireland, and is it sufficient r the proper working of this scheme? e whole question really turns upon is. First of all, I must enter a protest at any financial scheme put forward this Bill must be considered by us d dealt with by us without prejudice the great outstanding problem of e financial relations between the two untries. Upon that matter we stand on the Report of your own Royal ommission, men of your own, British perts who heard the evidence of the eatest British financiers of the day, cluding, the Opposition will be glad to member, Lord Milner, the Treasury ficials, as well as men like Sir Robert ffen, and who came to the unanimous nclusion—I believe there was one veat from Sir David Barbour—but with at exception they came practically to e unanimous conclusion that the terms the Act of Union were being violated, d that Ireland was being overtaxed, d had been since the year 1852, to the tent of between two and three millions year. There is a verdict in our favour. hat is a verdict in our favour by a bunal manned by yourselves. And at verdict has never been appealed from, d it stands now. I must enter a veat that so far as the finances of this ll are concerned that nothing can be nsidered by us except clearly without prejudice to the larger outstanding problems of the financial relations between this country and Ireland. Moreover, I give due notice to the Government that even if this Bill were passed to-morrow our demand would continue and would be renewed and pressed with all the vigour at our command for a settlement of the larger question. Now let me consider the finances as described by the right hon. Gentleman. As I understand it the present cost of these Departments is in the first instance to be handed over. In addition to that the local taxation moneys which amount to £1,300,000 are to be paid into an Irish fund. But of course that is no advantage to the Council or to Ireland. That is money that is being paid already, and the Council will be as a sort of aqueduct for paying the money out. So that it ought to be struck out of the calculation altogether. We have the present cost of the Departments roughly £2,000,000, and in addition to that £650,000 a year. We are told that £300,000 of that is in respect of Public Works, and £114,000 in respect of certain educational charges are to be put to what is called the capital account. I do not know what that means. If it means that these sums of £300,000 and £114,000 are not to be regarded as really part of the income of the Council, but small sums of money that will be paid every year for five or six years, then I have to express the gravest dissatisfaction. Let me deal with the question of public works. You must remember that in dealing with Ireland you are dealing with a neglected property, one that has fallen into dilapidation; and the first thing you have to do is to spend a considerable sum of money in putting the place into decent order. The right hon. Gentleman mentioned a number of various directions in which money would have to be spent on public works—railways, harbours, and so forth. Let me give the House an example of just one. There have been a series of Royal Commissions, extending I do not know how far back, dealing with the question of arterial drainage in Ireland. One of these reported that the want of arterial drainage is not only doing serious injury to agriculture, but is poisoning the climate, and is a cause of disease and sickness of all sorts and kind. We have never got any remedy. The remedy has always been to appoint a new

Royal Commission. Just before going out of office the late Government, in answer to our claim, having told us they could not do anything for us, gave us another Commission. This Commission has just reported, and anything more striking I cannot imagine. It first of all confirms everything said by all its predecessors extending back for generations; and it winds up by declaring that the state of things in Ireland is absolutely appalling. It says—

> "The annual rainfall is not greater than in England or Scotland, yet the climate is much damper. The humidity we believe is due, not only to the Gulf Stream and the southern winds, but also to the extent of the lodgment of the water all over the country. . . . Besides improving the climate, drainage would act upon the public health. There would be less pulmonary disease, less rheumatism, and less disease of other descriptions. There are districts after districts in which there is an enormous amount of work to be done."

Take the case which Unionist Members for Ireland press upon the Government, the flooding of the Bann—a flooding affecting five Ulster counties and causing widespread misery and disease all over the district. In the district of the river Barrow there are 46,000 acres of good land that are regularly flooded, and all the towns in that district are poisoned. All the medical experts tell us that the excessive cases of consumption and other diseases are due to the same cause. They can have no water supply. The water supply of these towns is always polluted. There is no system of drainage in these towns. The water practically comes up and blocks the sewers, and in that way disease is brought about. A more appalling state of things than exists on this drainage question you cannot conceive. Sir Antony MacDonnell made a speech in which, having deprecated the horrors of this state of things, he conceded it would take £3,000,000 to remedy it. He very much understated the case. The present Secretary to the Treasury said the other day, I think, £5,000,000, and unless I am greatly mistaken the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover said on one occasion when he was in office that the cost of a proper system of arterial drainage all over Ireland would run into £20,000,000. I say nothing of the 1,500,000 acres of waste land which experts tell us can be reclaimed or of the afforestation of 3,000,000 acres. Reafforestation is a great question. In 1886 a Committee was appointed to inquire into it. A Dutch expert gave evidence, and he declared that if the forests of Ireland had been cared for and fostered they would to-day be worth £100,000,000 of money. I say nothing about railroads, harbours, and other items. I take this one question of drainage, and I say that, if this £300,000 is not to be part of the income, but is to be a capital sum which at the end of five years is to cease, then your provision for public works in Ireland is ludicrously inadequate. I say the same about education. The provision which would thus be made for education would be altogether ludicrous. By what was said by statesmen on both sides of this House it would require £200,000 or more probably £300,000 a year to put primary education upon a proper footing. Does the House realise the fact that in Ireland the teacher of our children is paid less than the policeman? To remove that scandal will take a vast sum of money. Then there is intermediate education. Another anomaly of our precious system of government is that the amount to be spent upon intermediate education in Ireland depends upon the amount of whisky consumed by the people. [Laughter.] The House laughs at that, and, I suppose, many hon. Members are sceptical about the truth of it; but it is absolutely true. More than half of the income of the Intermediate Board in Ireland comes from whisky. ["It is the same in Scotland and in England."] I do not know about that. I put this question to my hon. friends opposite. There has been a wave of temperance, to the delight of everybody, flowing over these countries. What has the result been in England? Has that wave of temperance reduced by £20,000 a year the intermediate education grants? No. It has not reduced them by one penny, whereas in Ireland for the last four or five years, I think, the diminution in the consumption of whisky has had this direct result, that the grants for intermediate education have been reduced by about £12,000 to £15,000 a year, and we cannot even raise the question for discussion in this House, because we are told there is no Vote on the Estimates which would enable us to do so. Then there is the large provision which must be made for University education. I do not know whether, if this Bill were passed to-morrow and immediately afterwards a settlement of the University question were proposed, it would not be quite consistent to throw the cost of that settlement upon this Irish Fund you are now creating. For all these reasons I am myself strongly of opinion that the amount mentioned of £650,000 a year is altogether inadequate. Really, when the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition talks about the poor British taxpayer, is it not playing it a little bit too low down to profess that he thinks for one single moment that the British taxpayer is to provide this money? You get over £10,000,000 a year at the present moment of Irish money in Imperial taxes, and apart altogether from the finding of the Royal Commission you will find that every single penny required for a measure of this kind will come directly from the taxes paid by the Irish people themselves. So far from this Bill providing for the present cost of these Departments and the floating balance, so to speak, for the development of Ireland, the whole of that £650,000 will be mortgaged—every penny of it—from the day the measure passes, and it will be impossible under those conditions to work the scheme successfully. But we are told, "You have got your savings." The one great service upon which there can be any real appreciable saving you do not hand over to the Council at all, namely, the police service. The police in Ireland cost exactly three times what the police in Scotland cost, and I do not know that anyone will assert that Scotland is freer from crime than Ireland. I may put it in this way. In Ireland we have two and a half policemen for every 1,000 of our population. In Scotland you have only one policeman for every 800 of your population. The cost of the police in Scotland is £500,000. The cost of the police in Ireland is £1,500,000. That is the only service I know of where you could in a short time make a real saving. It is all nonsense to say it is necessary to keep up this great police force. It has been kept up as a separate political garrison. If once you could enlist the sympathy and confidence of the Irish people, it certainly is not an extraordinary thing to prophesy that Ireland could be policed by as few men and at as little cost as Scotland. In that way you would save £1,000,000 a year. I would ask the right hon. Gentleman where would that saving go? The Government are going to keep control under the present existing system of the police. Are they going to be kind enough to keep all savings that may be made under that service? If they are it is a monstrous injustice. It should be handed over for the service of the country. One word more and I am finished about this question of finance. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman was very clear about the Land Acts finance, and he did not convince me by his statement. Enormous liabilities exist and fresh ones are springing up every day under the Land Act of 1903. Are these expenses to be thrown on the Irish Council, or are they to be borne by the Treasury? That is a serious question, involving a vast sum of money, and until we have a clear and definite answer to it, it is impossible for us to express an opinion upon the question of finance as a whole. One more question as to a matter which concerns the Irish Members sitting here more than any other Members of this House, although it ought to concern every Member of this House. It is, Will this scheme, if carried into effect, be a hindrance or an aid to Home Rule? In other words, can a Home Ruler accept it? On the answer to that question our support of this Bill must depend. That is the question which will be submitted to our fellow-countrymen at the National Convention to be held in the City of Dublin very shortly, but it will be our duty to express our opinion on this Bill having given it consideration. If it does not give a real and effective control over these departments, if it does not prove a workable scheme and its finance is unjust, then this Bill if carried into law would lead to a breakdown. The Leader of the Opposition seems to think that a breakdown would be a good thing for Home Rule. I take exactly the opposite view. If this scheme came into operation and broke down what would people say? What would the right hon. Gentleman say? Not that the breakdown was due to this defect in the law or to this defect in the machine. No, they would say that the breakdown of the machine was due to defects in the character of the Irish people who conducted the machine, and we cannot take the responsibility of advising our people to accept any scheme which in our honest judgment we believe to be unworkable; because if it is unworkable I think that its breakdown will be looked upon by the people of England as a proof of the incapacity of the Irish people for self-government. But if, on the other hand, when we have considered it, we believe that this scheme is of such a character as to be capable of being worked with moderate success, I for one would agree that its enactment will be an aid and not a hindrance to Home Rule. If it works successfully it will show two things, I think—first, that the Irish people are not bereft of those qualities which have made their race successful governors everywhere else in the world; and, secondly, it will prove that the people of Ireland are not incapable of self-government, and it will also prove that they will not rest content until they get the full measure for which they are asking. I believe the more prosperous you make the people of Ireland, the better you educate them, and the wider you extend the powers of the Irish people, the greater will be their determination to obtain complete self-government. In that view I am inclined to think the successful working of this Bill would be an aid to Home Rule, and I can say for myself to-night I am anxious to find in this scheme, if I can, an instrument which, while it will admittedly not solve the Irish problem, will, at any rate, remove some of those most glaring and palpable causes which keep Ireland to-day poverty-stricken and Irishmen hopeless and discontented. It is in that sense that my colleagues and I will address ourselves to the serious consideration of this Bill. I have never in all the long years that I have been in this House spoken under such a heavy sense of responsibility as I am speaking on this measure this afternoon. Ever since Mr. Gladstone's Bill of 1886 Ireland has been waiting for some scheme to settle the problem—waiting sometimes in hope, sometimes almost in despair, but the horrible thing is this, that all the time that Ireland has been so waiting there has been a gaping wound in her side and her sons have had to stand by helpless while they saw her very life blood flowing out. Who can say that is an exaggeration? Twenty years of resolute government by the Party above the gangway have diminished the population of Ireland by a million. No man in any position of influence can take upon himself the awful responsibility of despising and putting upon one side any device that may arrest that hæmorrhage, even although he believed, as I do, that far different remedies must be applied before Ireland can stand upon her feet in vigorous strength. We are determined as far as we are concerned that these other remedies shall be applied, but in the meantime we should shrink from the responsibility of rejecting anything which, after that full consideration which the Bill will receive, seems to our deliberate judgment calculated to relieve the sufferings of Ireland and hasten the day of her full national convalescence.

*Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe): I rise to put forward the views of the Labour Party on the Bill which has been laid before the House by the Chief Secretary. We were certainly strong Home Rulers before we were ever constituted as a separate Party, and we should have been better pleased this afternoon if we had been listening to a Home Rule speech from the right hon. Gentleman. We cannot but express our regret that the democratic spirit that governed the Liberal Party in 1886 and 1895 does not govern that Party to-day. But at the same time we recognise that it is only a question of time, and that self-government for Ireland will have to come some day, and the longer it is delayed the more will have to be paid to the credit of that country in consequence of the trouble which exists in it under our administration. We are, however, anxious, as far as we are concerned, not to hamper the Government in this matter, provided that opportunities are given to strengthen the Bill. There is room for it, and if it can be strengthened in the direction of democratic rule we shall be willing to support it as a step in the right direction. Judging from the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition he would prefer this Bill to become law in order to show it is unworkable, and if it was unworkable it would prove that only Home Rule was necessary to meet the demands of the Irish people. I think that full administrative powers should be given to the Irish people, and I should like this Bill to be one which would give them the greatest administrative powers that they can have. I do not agree with the nominated element on the Council. No democrat could, but if it pleases the Irish Members to say that in order to show their *bona fides* they are prepared to accept this proposal I cannot object, but I am not prepared to go that length myself. I think that everyone serving on a governing body should be elected to office, and I think that everybody who represents a county or a borough should periodically come before the electors to be judged by his work and to show the way in which he has managed the affairs of the body of which he is a member. I do not think this Bill will satisfy the aspirations of the Labour Party or of the Liberal Party in the country. I believe that since 1895 the feeling ot the country has been changed in the direction of giving the people of Ireland greater powers than this Bill confers upon them. As to co-ordination, I believe that this Bill will be a considerable improvement; it must be an improvement upon the present system. I have been a constant listener to the debates on Irish matters in this House, and I can assure the House that there is no sadder feeling than that they could be better conducted among the Irish people themselves. I believe that this Council will be the means of relieving this House of some little of the time it has to give to Irish matters and some of its work in connection with them. The minor details we have to listen to sometimes will be removed no doubt, but the chief gain to this House will be that less time will be occupied at Question time. Many of the Questions asked of the right hon. Gentleman by hon. Members behind me, Questions relating to matters for which the right hon. Gentleman is not responsible, will be transferred to this Council, but I cannot see that a great deal will accrue to England and Scotland. There may be a slight improvement, but nothing that we can be proud of. Looking at the measure itself it appears to me that the administration of the police ought to be conferred upon this Council. I cannot imagine how any Englishman would feel if he had some person outside his own country who claimed the right to govern the police in this country. Is the Irishman not a trustworthy citizen and has he not the good of his country at heart? I think it would be the one other proof of our trust in the Irish people to give them the control of their own police. I think our not doing so is the blot on this Bill. The reason for it I know. It is because a minority in this country have in some way or other to be satisfied. But that is not in accordance with my view. I think a trustful spirit should be shown by giving Irishmen more control. The only other point is whether the Labour Members can support this measure as Home Rulers. I said in my opening statement that I regret this is not a wider measure, but I believe that short of a measure of full self-government within the lines that everyone understands there is something to be said for this step. Just as the county councils of Ireland have assured the British people of the ability of Irishmen to govern, so, I think, this Council will further show the trustworthiness of our friends across the water. I trust in going into this matter in detail the Government will not be hostile to any suggestions that may be made by Irish and other Members. I trust that this scheme as given us to-day will not be considered to be the final word, and in no sense a proposal beyond which no further powers will be granted. I hope what we have got now will be considered a starting-point, and that, so far as this Bill is concerned, before it reaches another place it will be a much more Radical measure than it is at present. I believe such a policy would be more in harmony with the views of the people of this country than a policy of cutting down, and therefore we shall support every effort our Irish friends make to extend the measure in the direction of giving greater power to Irishmen to administer the affairs of their own country.

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.): I should like, as one who was born and bred and has lived in Ireland, to take this opportunity of stating, on behalf of my constituency and many people I know in Ulster, the view we take of the proposals laid before the House to-day. I could not help, when I heard the speech of the Chief Secretary and the answers given by the Prime Minister on the subject-matter of this Bill, noticing how they endeavoured to minimise its effect and create the idea in the country and the House that whatever the proposals might be they were not Home Rule or an instalment of it. I was reminded of the efforts made by Mr. Gladstone, when the Bill of 1893 was before the House, to show that Home Rule was not a breach of the Union. I cordially concur in what fell from the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, that in Ireland, I care not to which Party a man belongs, the real question which everybody has in view from his respective standpoint is whether this proposal makes for Home Rule, for what the hon. Member calls the national demand, or whether from our point of view it makes against it. Perhaps that is not putting it correctly. If we find these proposals are in the opinion of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford an aid to Home Rule——

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I said if this measure fulfilled certain conditions I laid down we should consider it an aid to Home Rule. I do not know whether it does or not till I have examined it.

MR. MOORE: If, in his view, the Bill makes certain proposals, he would consider it an aid to Home Rule. On the basis that the Bill will carry out what it professes to carry out the hon. and learned Member will consider it an aid to Home Rule. The hon. Gentleman representing the Labour Party said the Bill did not go sufficiently far; that he has been a convinced Home Ruler all his life and that he thinks this would help Home Rule, and when we find the hon. Member for Waterford praising it as an aid to Home Rule and the hon. Gentleman below the gangway can support it as a convinced Home Ruler, then it gives us cause at home to consider that it makes for Home Rule and separation. The House will understand that the people we have the honour to represent here are as determined and inflexible as ever in their opposition to any legislation in Ireland that will tend towards Home Rule and separation. In recent years part of the political machinery of the wirepullers of the Nationalist Party has been the suggestion that Ulster has been weakening in its resistance and objection to Home Rule. That has been put about by Nationalist partisans for Party motives. There was never a greater political slander or mis-statement. There are only two Parties in Ulster at the present time. We are sometimes told of a third Party; a Party which is the survival of the old Liberal Party in Ulster. Everything worth preserving of the old Liberal Party when the hour of crisis arrived for Ireland, when the whole interest of the country was at stake, joined the Unionist Party and has acted loyally with it ever since. I believe the Government fulfills its promises to the old Liberal Party by making them all magistrates. The only test you can apply to such statements is that of an election. In West Belfast at the last election we had a Liberal, a Nationalist, and a Unionist candidate, and the figures are most instructive as a counter fact to the suggestion that there is any weakening in Ulster on the question of their opposition to Home Rule The Nationalist candidate who nailed his colours to the mast and was elected received 4,138 votes, the Unionist 4,122, and the third Party, the gentleman who represented the Liberal force in Ulster, the gentleman, who, typical of his class was prepared to become a magistrate or seek other honours, who was willing to traffic in every constituency and sell every principle, got 153 votes. After that we are told that the third Party whose representative received 153 votes is a sign that Ulster is weakening in its opposition to Home Rule. These figures have only to be examined to see how the third Party stood at the last general election. There have been three by-elections since, and these showed that the question of the Union was and still is an important one. It was the sole plank, except that the Ulster Radical described himself as a Devolutionist. But the people of North Armagh paid their candidate the highest honour by multiplying the majority of a man like the late Colonel Saunderson two and a half times. I do not think the hon. Gentleman who last spoke realised what the democracy is who support us in Ulster. At the election the other day in Belfast, the main and foremost plank in that democratic constituency was the Union, and they increased a majority of 291 to over 1,800. My hon. friend was opposed by a member of the Labour Party, and what attitude did his opponent take? In my University days I was told that hypocrisy was the homage of vice to virtue; and on this occasion, such was the feeling in favour of Unionism in Belfast, that our opponent in his address, in his placards, and in his speeches, described himself as good a Unionist as the hon. Member beside me. To grant Home Rule or separation would be to hand us over and place us at the disposal of hon. Members below the gangway. You have the question of tariff reform in England, and you have those who are against it, and those who are for it, believing that it would increase employment. I am not going into that question. I merely mention it as an illustration of what I advance. In our constituencies, the people who send us here, the industrial classes of the North of Ireland, recognise the importance of the Union in regard to their employment just as here the importance of tariff reform is recognised in regard to industry. Unionism is a question of the livelihood of the people in the North of Ireland. The workman in Ulster knows that under the Union there is security for him and his work, for capital and for industry; he knows that while the integrity of the United Kingdom is preserved there is safety for him. You find masters and men, on the question of the Union, appearing on the same platform, and voting in the same polling booth. The maintenance of the Union is the predominant question with them. I say that our constituents are as democratic on various questions as hon. Members below the gangway, but the preservation of the Union stands first with them, and it is only right that this evidence should be put before the House by one who has the honour to represent them and who knows them. We were told rather contemptuously by the Chief Secretary that we are only 1,100,000. We do not mind that taunt from the Chief Secretary. It is part of the minimising process. The right hon. Gentleman has told us that all Irishmen are lacking in self-respect.

MR. BIRRELL: When did I say that?

MR. MOORE: Well, the right hon. Gentleman spoke in a patronising English way, and said that if Irishmen adopted his proposals they would be educated in self-respect. I disclaim the compliments of the Chief Secretary, and I believe that, in spite of the manner the Chief Secretary has adopted towards them earlier in the session, Ulster Members have persuaded him that they are entitled to a little more respect. I also ask the House to remember it is not a mere question of numbers. If 1,100,000 people were taken from Connaught and Munster, they would not be missed. Blot out 1,000,000 of the industrial people of Ulster, and there would only be left that part of the country which seemed unwilling to prosper. It will not take the advantages which the people of Ulster have taken under the common law, a law which applies to Belfast in every respect as to Cork, a law under which the North of Ireland has been made prosperous, simply by industry, by resisting intimidation, by attending to their business, and by ignoring politics. If we blotted Ulster out of the map of Ireland, with its 1,100,000 inhabitants, hon. Members below the gangway would have nothing to tax. I believe I am right in saying that the City and Port of Belfast, that one town in the North of Ireland built up under the same British law which applies to the rest of the country, provides one-third of the revenue of Ireland. It is not a question of counting heads. We have to consider what share the population, whose right to live is being questioned, bears to the fortunes of the country. That is why Ulster has a right to have its opinions heard and considered in this House. Even the Government with the worst grace in the world has recognised that they must protect minorities, though I am sure, from answers given in the House by the Chief Secretary, that it is not willingly done, and that they must protect what Chancellor of the Exchequer called lately a "noisy and diminishing section of the people." I think there is nothing more remarkable than the attitude of the Liberal Party towards the Nationalists. In 1885, the Liberal Government was ready to trust them with the fullest powers. In 1903 there was a diminution of the powers given, thus showing a diminution of confidence in Nationalists. To-day the confidence had reached the lowest point of the thermometer. They are not allowed to deal with the police, they are not to touch the judiciary, or to deal with any of the Boards of Ireland, except some eight of them, and this is softened with the suggestion that they will receive £600,000 a year extra to console their wounded pride. The one essential thing is that it will be placarded throughout the country that this is not Home Rule. I have referred to the support of the Union given by Ulster. What was the position of Ulster 100 years ago? The Union which was then proposed had no more bitter opponents than these very people of Ulster. They stood out as a body against it. Some of them took the field against it. What in the course of history have not Ulstermen found? [AN HON. MEMBER: Money.] That was not our standard. For a century they have discovered that they can live and thrive under British law, that it gives them security for their rights, liberty, and religion, that it has made them contented, as it is capable of making the rest of Ireland contented if there is any real wish that it should be contented. One important change has been the fact that a complete and extended system of local government has been introduced as part of Unionist policy, and has been in full working order for the last eight years. The fact is that there is not an English county that enjoys superior powers over an Irish county in the matter of local government. Also as a part of Unionist policy—which has been of very great benefit to Ireland—the British taxpayer has become a creditor or a mortgagor on the land to the extent of £50,000,000, and this country has pledged itself to raise £100,000,000 in addition as occasion requires. A financial bond of interest has in this way been created between the two countries, a result which has been achieved with the fullest concurrence and consent of the Nationalist Members below the gangway. There has also been a very large investment of money by English railway companies in Irish railways, and it must be recognised that the expenditure of English railway shareholders' money is necessarily another link in the interests which bind the two countries together. There is another matter to which I must allude, and I do so with some regret, because it has reference to the conduct of hon. Members below the gangway. The House has had a very suggestive illustration of their feelings towards the United Kingdom since the last Home Rule Bill was introduced by their very regrettable conduct during the Boer War. Although the county councils in Ireland have been given the fullest power they were ready to pass resolutions denouncing the British Army and the British nation, in every way lending comfort and sustenance to British enemies in the field. When the House comes to consider the relations between this country and Ireland it is necessary for them to consider what are the political opinions and actions of the men to whom the Government propose to commit the government of Ireland, and in considering them they should not forget—at least those who have the interests of the Empire at heart—the attitude they took up during that war. I say it with regret that on Imperial questions there are occasions when Members below the gangway cannot be trusted. That seems to make it absolutely essential that in all schemes brought before the House we should consider how far the control of the Imperial Parliament is to be preserved before any matter of administration is committed to Members below the gangway, because the control of the Imperial Parliament is really the only safeguard the minority has in Ireland. In this respect I believe that the provisions in the Bill are lame and ineffective, and will prove to be wholly inoperative. The only safeguard which the minority of Ireland can look to as effective is the continuous control of the Imperial Parliament of the United Kingdom. I was struck with the proposal in the Bill which proposes to set up again an Irish Treasury. In the Act of Union there was a provision that the Irish Exchequer should be continued, but after it had been worked for seventeen years it was found that the system of having two Exchequers did not make for economy or smooth working, and by Act of Parliament it was determined that the Irish Exchequer should be abolished in the interests of the whole of the United Kingdom, and there should be one Exchequer for the three countries. I consider it an ominous sign that we are setting up, under another name, the old Irish Exchequer. We are told that these powers are limited, but I could not help noticing that every time the right hon. Gentleman referred to a limitation of powers he always spoke hopefully of the Lord-Lieutenant being able to make provision for extending the whole scheme. It seems to me that in setting up a separate Irish Exchequer we are retracing our steps to what existed before the Act of Union, and therefore this is a proposal which will have to be very closely looked into. Speaking in Lancashire the other day, the Chief Secretary for Ireland complained of the diminished quantity of business which the Government mill had been able to do, and he said that the poison of Irish business ran through the House and through the business and almost paralysed their efforts. It has often been said on English platforms that if the Government would only devolve Irish business there would be more time for British social reforms. I hope it will be made clear to the House that this Bill does nothing of the sort, because Irish Members will still be here and so will the Ulster Members. There will not be a single day less of Irish Supply, and it will only mean that when an Irish Member below the gangway addresses the House he will not be able to deal with the business of these eight Departments. To say that the Irish "poison" to which the Chief Secretary referred will be removed by this Bill is saying something which is a very gross perversion of the facts. I do not understand that the Chief Secretary even suggests that that would be the result of these proposals. I believe this scheme is intended to remove entirely from the control of the House of Commons the money voted for the services of those Departments, so that there cannot be any debate upon them in the House of Commons. The British taxpayer will contribute his quota to the Treasury, and £2,600,000 will be removed from the Consolidated Fund. That cannot be debated in this House, and what the British taxpayer subscribes is to be debated and discussed by a body in Ireland to which he is not qualified to send any representatives. If taxation and representation go together what is now proposed would be a very gross breach of the Constitution, and it should not be hurried through in a Bill of this sort. I maintain that the British taxpayer has a right to discuss through his representatives every expenditure or allocation of money from the Imperial Treasury which comes out of the Consolidated Fund. That is a constitutional matter which I think deserves the very serious attention of all who have the effective working of our Parliamentary system at heart. What is the real scope of this Bill? An Education Board is to be formed, but will that Board have power to deal with higher education in Ireland, and will it have power to deal with University education as well? I should like to know, if a body of Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland obtained a King's Letter—which they can do without coming to Parliament at all—enabling them to found a University, would the Education Committee appointed under this Bill have power to endow that University out of the general funds which come to this Council for the purposes of education? Certainly as far as the right hon. Gentleman's statement has gone there does not seem to be anything to prevent that, and it would be tantamount to a Parliamentary fraud that by a side wind such as that this harmless-looking Bill should authorise in Ireland the establishment of a Roman Catholic University, which, as hon. Members know, is a subject upon which we feel very strongly indeed on this side of the House. There should be some limitation of this Bill, as there was in the Home Rule Bills, for preventing the endowment of a religion in this way. I see that at every turn in this measure there are opportunities for a Nationalist majority to put a block in the way of the Government, and the House of Commons will lose control over Irish Estimates. I know what would happen about the Bann if this Council were set up. I am sure that a Nationalist majority on the Council in Dublin would not vote a penny for the drainage of the Bann.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: A gross slander.

Mr. MOORE: I will now refer to the question of the block of business. The Council is to take over the work of the Agricultural Department, and I should like to put this case to the Chief Secretary. I understand that English Radical opinion is that Canadian stores should be freely admitted to the United Kingdom. Irish opinion is that they should not, and I know that the Irish Council would unanimously arrive at the decision to keep Canadian stores out of Ireland. I want to know whether, if Canadian stores are admitted to the United Kingdom, the Irish Council will have power to prohibit their landing in Ireland? There is not a single one of these Irish boards which are being transferred to the new body which would not cause a most troublesome deadlock between themselves and the Government of the day. The reason I object to that is this. Every time such a deadlock is caused it will simply be made another occasion for levying more Parliamentary blackmail by hon. Members below the gangway upon the Government, the price of which is always paid at the Unionist expense in Ireland. I was reproached just now for saying that the Bann would receive no consideration from the Council in Dublin. I regret to say that the professions by hon. Members of conciliation, good-will, and toleration to the Unionist minority in Ireland, which have been made again and again, and which I am not going to suggest they do not believe themselves, have been controverted whenever an attempt has been made to carry them into effect. I was present at a meeting in the University of Dublin, and the hon. Member for Waterford was on the platform. I heard him make a speech which, if he will allow me to say so, would do credit to any Christian man, and in which he pleaded for the most intense toleration for his fellow countrymen who were Unionists. It was on the eve of the Local Government Bill coming into force. The hon. and learned Member said—and I have no doubt that he was perfectly sincere—that he hoped Unionists throughout Ireland would be allowed to take their own share in the county councils and the district councils about to be formed. How was that advice carried out? He is lacking in control over the people for whom he professes to speak. I do not suggest for a moment that he did not act up to what he said. There are 244 county councillors in the province of Munster. Two Unionists were allowed in. That is local government in Munster. There are 144 county councillors in Connaught, but only two Unionists were allowed to take part in the local government of that province. I say without fear of contradiction that there is not a county council in Unionist Ulster in which Nationalists are not welcomed and allowed a full share of fair play. [NATIONALIST cries of "Oh!"]

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will you name one division where you have a majority and admit a Nationalist?

MR. MOORE: I think I may take Portadown. There has been a respected Roman Catholic on the council there for years. That is one instance. I knew that hon. Members below the gangway would not like it. When the County Councils Association was formed in 1899 or 1900, under the chairmanship of the hon. Baronet who sits for one of the divisions of Wexford, it was to be composed of two delegates from every county council in Ireland, and they were to meet together in Dublin to consult for the furtherance of county council interests. It was originally understood that all political, religious, and controversial matters were to be excluded from the consideration of the association. I have to mention this to show how it has been borne in on the Irish minority that facts are too strong for the protestation of toleration and conciliation we are to receive from hon. Members below the gangway on crucial occasions such as those to which I have referred. The Unionist counties of Down, Derry, and Antrim, sent up their members to take part in the proceedings of the association in Dublin; no politics were discussed, and they did excellent business. I do not know that all the Nationalist counties were represented very well—the members had to attend at their own expense. In 1902, however, a Local Government Act was passed which allowed the expenses of the delegates to be charged upon the rates, and from that time there was a very ample attendance at the meetings, and the Nationalist majority said they were going to propose a resolution about Home Rule. The hon. Baronet who occupied the chair got up and said that this action was a breach of faith, and that he would resign his position as a protest. The Duke of Abercorn put the case very well when he said to the chairman, "It is not your fault. Your resigning would not satisfy us." Thereupon the Nationalists passed a resolution declaring the inalienable right of all Irishmen to govern themselves, and the Unionist county councillors were obliged to withdraw, and they are now excluded from all participation in the business of the Central County Councils Association. This action of the Nationalist majority was taken in the face of the most explicit undertaking that politics were not to be introduced. Can you blame the Irish minority if we refuse to accept at their face value the protestations as to the kindly and good treatment reserved for us in future? The hon. Member for Waterford, some time ago, made a speech in which he referred to a certain section who disagreed with him. He said he would have to use a strong hand in certain circumstances. He said he did not use that language in regard to the whole of the Unionist population. He certainly used it in regard to some section of the population, and when you get a leader who, in a public place in Ulster, is able to get up and threaten any section of his opponents with a strong hand when Home Rule is introduced, it does not make for conciliation or toleration, and Irish Unionists are justified in their attitude of suspicion or distrust, which unfortunately the whole trend of events in Ireland has obliged them to take up. I pass by the attacks which I have heard made in the House by the hon. Member for King's County on certain clerks of certain boards in Dublin who happen to be Protestants. I think that is a very unfortunate sign of the toleration we have been so glibly promised in more quarters than one. The point of the whole thing is this. With regard to these departments, the central Council is to have the power of the purse. Of course, if they are a central Council, say for public works in Ireland, it will be their duty to look after the entire material interest of the country. Having in view the policy announced again and again by the Nationalists, I want to know what chance we have in Ulster of receiving any share of the funds to be handed over to the Council for distribution? We have had protestations of good treatment, but we have to look at probabilities. In the new Council the Unionists will find themselves in a minority. We might have eighteen elected members, and the Government might give us twelve of the nominated members, so that we should have thirty out of the 110 members. What chance would that give that the material interests of Ulster would be attended to when it came to a question of voting on a resolution brought before the Irish Council, unless we have a guarantee of fair play, and unless the provisions for the protection of minorities go further than the Chief Secretary has suggested? It seems to me, if I may suggest an alteration, that a very fair way of preventing injustice to minorities in that respect would be to allocate the annual amount to be spent province by province in accordance with the valuation of each province. That would remove one of the objections which every Unionist would have to the Bill. It would not remove all our objections. I am sure the Chief Secretary is not sanguine enough to expect that. It would remove the very grave apprehension which we have in the light of past experience, and our claims would have some faint chance of being considered. I do not think that there is anything in the question of economy. I understand that the whole or the main ground for any change in the administration of affairs in Ireland is to be the reduction of expense. The question of the cost of the police has been trotted out in organ after organ of the Party opposite. We have also had reference to the cost of the judiciary. If the Nationalist Party would discontinue certain methods of agitation the police could be reduced by one-half. Patriots who are anxious to economise the resources of the country might adopt that suggestion. I understand that the only amalgamation that will be effected is the creation of one Board instead of three. I do not understand whether the other Departments who do now exist are to be subordinated to the General Irish Council. I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that the powers to be given to the Council are to be carried out by the existing Department so that the Government have abolished nothing. But in addition to that you are setting up four or five new committees with paid officials. I cannot, therefore, see how in any manner the administration of the country is to be cheapened by the right hon. Gentleman's proposals.

MR. BIRRELL: I may say that there is a power to amalgamate portions of the administration by means of an Order in Council if it can possibly be done.

MR. MOORE: I understand that that is to be done at a future date, but for the present the cost will not be diminished. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford and the hon. Member for East Mayo have put forward at different times the claim that Ireland should be treated as a Colony; and to-day the hon. Member for Waterford in the course of his eloquent speech referred to the system of independent government which we have given to the Transvaal. From the Irish Unionist point of view we regard our position as infinitely higher than that of a Colony. There is not a Colony which has the privilege of sending representatives to this House—a privilege for which there is not one of them which would not pay a very large price—I do not say in money. We have at the present time popular control over every penny of expenditure in Ireland through the Irish representatives in this House. Of course the Irish people have not the exclusive control which a self-governing constitution would give them, but they have the protection and authority of this House to see that in that expenditure justice and security are given to all sections of the Irish people. There is another distinction. I know of no Colony which receives grants for public services out of the Imperial Treasury as Ireland does. A perfect stream has flowed and flows out of the Imperial Treasury for public services in Ireland. Some Irish Members talk about Irish money, but I contend that the only purely Irish fund was the money derived from the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and nearly every penny of that has been devoted to Irish purposes. I do not see how it is possible to separate Irish money from the contributions to the Imperial Treasury any more than it is possible to separate Scottish or English money. If there were three boxes into which the respective contributions from Ireland, Scotland and England were put, I am sure that, compared with those from England and Scotland, that from Ireland would be found to be very small. It is not in the interest of Ireland that there should be separate accounts for each part of the United Kingdom. Every attempt to put Ireland in the position of a Colony weakens our claims to make drafts on the Imperial Treasury. It is conceded that Ireland is a poor country, and we must have Imperial grants and Imperial credit to assist in our development. Why, we have advantages for Ireland which are far above those of any Colony. I object that hon. Gentleman from Ireland below the gangway should degrade their country by asking that it should be placed in the position of a Colony. The right hon. Gentleman will find that by his proposed Measure he cannot get rid of the Ulster question. We feel deeply on this matter. I believe that when this Bill is printed and comes to be studied there will not be a provision in it which cannot be manipulated by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway to the injury of Ulster. No safeguards are given to us equal to the adequate protection and control of the Imperial Parliament. We are quite ready to protect ourselves. [Ironical IRISH cheers.] I am speaking of the Council to be given by the Council. [An IRISH MEMBER: The walls of Jericho.] We have as much right to be protected from oppression and injustice, as a numerically small body, as the majority have. I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will give as much consideration as he can to the points I have indicated.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I wish to draw attention to the remarkable fact that the hon. and learned Member for North Armagh had omitted in his references to elections to refer to that at Derry where he was put out by a Liberal by a majority of almost 1,000. It was curious that an event of that kind should escape the hon. Member's recollection.

MR. MOORE: He said he was a Unionist!

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: You got out any way. The next statement was that if this Council were set up not a farthing would be voted for the draining of the River Bann. Why, the only movement made in the last Parliament for that drainage came from these Benches and the Nationalist Benches, and the hon.

Gentleman did nothing in that direction. Was that not a fact?

MR. MOORE: No.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Well the hon. Gentleman cannot get beyond the records of Parliament. The hon. and learned Member for North Armagh declared that Ireland had not a penny of her own. Well, it is a matter of plain book-keeping. The Irish payments are £10,000,000 and the cost of administration is £7,000,000. It is not, therefore, fair of the hon. Gentleman to say that the Irish have nothing to their credit. But that is just a sample of his many reckless statements. I have risen to point out what the position of Ulster Members really means. They have for months past been preparing the people of Ulster for a Home Rule Bill, and they are immensely disappointed, because the people are a shrewd people and it will take the Unionist Members some trouble to convince the people of Ulster that this is a Home Rule Bill. The Bill does not impinge upon the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, and it does not interfere with the presence of Irish Members in this House, and it has nothing to do with the land question. What is the difficulty which Irish Unionist Members have in regard to a Bill of that kind? I know what it is. Ever since the Union of Ireland the government has practically been in their hands. They have worked that government for their own purpose. Every position of trust and emolument and honour has been filled by what is called "the gang." They have seen the power slipping from them and mainly by Unionist legislation. Irish Unionists have had under Dublin Castle complete power over the machine all that time. They have it at present. It matters little to the people of Ireland what Government is in office, the Tories are always the power there because they have complete control of the whole of the machine of administration. From the magistrates up through the whole gamut of officials these gentlemen have occupied posts for the whole period of the Union. They oppose the Bill because they see that their privileges —they have no rights in the matter—are in danger. It is because the old system is going—the system of administration by patronage and jobs; that is the sole ground upon which they can logically oppose the Bill. That is the reason the Bill will be fought to the death. The Unionists have lost five seats in Ulster since 1886—a considerable number out of the small band of twenty, and they now hold some seats only by trifling majorities. It is perfect nonsense to say there is no change in the opinion of the people of Ulster. I do not say that the people of Ulster will vote for Home Rule. There is, however, a change in the position of Ulster, and men are willing to consider political questions as they never considered them before. They are sick to death of that miserable spirit which keeps Irishmen apart from each other. I am confident that in so far as the Bill abolishes the power of Dublin Castle and transfers the power to the representatives of the Irish people a very large mass of the Protestants of Ulster will stand up for the Bill and the Government that promotes it.

*MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): As I listened to the speech of the Chief Secretary I was reminded of a passage in one of those charming essays which have come from his pen, in which he draws a distinction between a mandate and a mission. If my memory serves me I think the right hon. Gentleman has used the language of good-natured contempt on the subject of mandates. He has said, for instance, that—

> "Only poor, miserable, degraded politicians have mandates. Authors have missions."

The Chief Secretary was writing as an author; but it would be very interesting if he would tell us in which character he submits his present proposals to the House. Is he the mere politician with a mandate? Or does he look upon himself as a man with a mission? If we are to regard the right hon. Gentleman as a missionary—a modern St. Augustine—then whatever view we may take of his policy, we must all, I think, admire his courage, because one gathers from his writings that he is not oblivious of the fate which usually awaits the missionary. He has reminded us that—

> "When a town turns out to welcome a missionary it is not usually with loud applause, but with large stones."

I think it is not improbable that the right hon. Gentleman may have occasion before very long to reflect upon the accuracy of his own generalisation. Be that as it may, I think we must adopt the view that this *is* a missionary effort on the part of the right hon. Gentleman; because it is admitted on all hands that the Government have no mandate from the electors of Great Britain to give Ireland Home Rule. It is beyond question that at the time of the general election several Members of the present Government led the people to believe that if a Liberal Government were returned to power they would not propose any measure of Home Rule. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was very explicit on this point. Speaking at Newcastle-under-Lyme, on November 27th, 1905, the right hon. Gentleman admitted that if there was to be a Liberal majority at the general election—

> "It would be gained by large numbers of people who voted against the Liberal Party in 1895, or abstained from voting at all, voting with the Liberal Party next time."

And then he went on to say—

> "Now it would not be honest, in his opinion, to use the votes of men given in that way to reverse the verdict of the country with regard to Home Rule which was given in 1895."

The Chief Secretary himself, was one of those who pooh-poohed the idea of a Liberal Government bringing in a Home Rule Bill. The notion was derided as a mere bogey. The Prime Minister described it as a scarecrow. The Government and their supporters obtained many Unionist votes on the strength of those assurances, and the present Ministry was undoubtedly returned to power upon the understanding that Home Rule would not form any part of its programme. And yet, after only a few months of office, we find the Government making an insidious attempt to reverse the verdict of 1895. The introduction of this Bill, in view of the pledges given at the general election, convicts His Majesty's Ministers of an act of political dishonesty which is surely without a parallel in the history of this country. Of course we are all aware of the attempt of the Government to cover up their flagrant violation of their assurances by inventing a specious and innocent-looking title for their Bill. That is too ancient a trick to deceive anybody. There are certain familiar lines—with which I have no doubt the Prime Minister is acquainted—which seem to me to be applicable to this case—

> "The merchant to secure his treasure
> Conveys it in a borrowed name;
> Euphelia serves to grace my measure,
> But Chloë is my real flame."

An "Irish Council Bill" certainly does not sound very revolutionary; but the country will be asked to examine this Bill in the light of the sinister declarations of the Prime Minister. What did the right hon. Gentleman say in his famous speech at Stirling? These are his words—

> "Now ladies and gentlemen, there are two ways of capturing a stronghold—by an open and high-handed assault, or by a process of sap and gradual approach. What matters it which of these methods you use provided you ultimately capture the citadel?"

This Bill, is part of the "process of sap and gradual approach"; and, therefore, it is an attempt to reverse the verdict of the country with regard to Home Rule which was given in 1895, which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs declared this Government could not put forward without sacrifice of honesty. I would like to ask the Government this question: "If this Bill is not Home Rule, what justification have they for introducing it at all?" The whole case for the proposal is that it is intended to meet the Irish demand. But whether it is Home Rule or not, Irish Unionists certainly do not want it. As for the Nationalists, if it were not Home Rule, they would repudiate it at once. The mere fact that hon. Members below the Gangway accept it as an instalment of the "larger policy," disposes at once of the assertion of the Government that it is not Home Rule. The Government have betrayed a positive genius for subterfuge, but when the electors of Great Britain have this Bill before them, they will not be long in discovering the real nature and purpose of these proposals; and they will not be slow in arriving at the conclusion that the measure represents an attempt on the part of His Majesty's Ministers to perpetrate a gigantic political fraud upon the people of Great Britain. At election times Radicals talk largely about the social reforms they mean to accomplish. But when, on the strength of their promises and professions, they are returned to power, they immediately begin to complain of the obstacles in their path. They either go a-tilting at the House of Lords, or they raise the cry that "Ireland blocks the way!" I suppose, we may take it that this Bill is an attempt to remove the Irish block out of the path towards the social millennium, which exists only in the perfervid dreams of Radical politicians. If that is the object of the measure, all I can say is, that of all the means which could be devised to accomplish the end in view, this is surely, the least effectual.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) called attention to the fact that forty Members were not present.

*MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order. I thought the hon. Gentleman was aware that the House could not be counted out between 8.15 and 9.15.

*MR. LONSDALE: It cannot be denied that under existing conditions the affairs of Ireland occupy a very large part of the time of this House. I can quite understand some Members thinking that Ireland gets far more than her proper share of attention. But will the measure now before the House lessen in any degree the demands which Ireland makes upon the consideration of the Imperial Parliament? I do not see how the Government or the Party opposite can expect this proposal to relieve the congestion of public business. If it is their object to get rid of "the Irish block," as it is called, by satisfying Ireland, then, all I can say is this Bill certainly will not satisfy anyone. Unionists, of course, will to the uttermost oppose its passage here, and should it get through Parliament, they would strenuously resist its operation in Ireland. The Nationalists make no pretence of accepting it in full settlement of their demands. They are willing to take it only as an instalment; or as the hon. and learned Member for Waterford has said, as a foundation upon which they can build. What is it they mean to build? It is only due to the Nationalist Party to say that they have never made any secret of their intentions. If they get their Council they mean to turn it into a Parliament as quickly as they can. The Parliament they contemplate is not the subordinate body—which is all that the Lord Chancellor is prepared to give them, but an independent Parliament with an executive responsible thereto. The Council which the Chief Secretary proposes to set up in Dublin will give the Nationalists large powers of control over the administration, but the powers of the new body will be restricted. It will, therefore, become the immediate object of the Nationalists to remove those limitations. Those efforts will be made upon the floor of this House, by hon. Members below the Gangway, who will be present here in full force to make their demands. At the same time the House may be very sure that Nationalist administration of the affairs of Ireland will furnish Irish Unionists with any number of subjects for Question and debate in this House. If the Government hope that this Council will be a sort of buffer between Parliament and the people of Ireland they will be quickly undeceived. So far from relieving this House, under the scheme of modified Home Rule now proposed, I do not hesitate to say that Ireland would make more demands upon its attention than ever before. So far, I have discussed the negative effects of this proposal. Now I would ask the House to consider the positive consequences of the policy of Home Rule by instalments. If this Bill were carried, the entire control of Irish local affairs would be placed in the hands of the Nationalist Party. Let hon. Members dismiss from their minds the idea that under this scheme the Loyalist section of the community would be given any appreciable share in the administration. They are the principal contributors to the revenue. It is their industry and grit which have made Ulster prosperous. They are law-abiding, and loyal to the Union and the Empire. But they will be excluded from any effective voice in the management of the affairs of their country. I do not see any ground whatever for doubting that the new Irish Council, if established, would become immediately a purely political organisation with aims and objects hostile to Great Britain. The history of the General Council of County Councils in Ireland has a bearing upon this point which hon. Members opposite would do well to note. This body was established on a strictly non-political basis for the purpose of assisting the equable administration of the Local Government Act. It comprised representatives from every county council in Ireland. Unionists and Nationalists met together to discuss questions of local government, and for a time the council did useful work. But the Nationalists were not satisfied with this arrangement. They very soon insisted upon giving a political bias to the organisation, and began by passing resolutions in favour of Home Rule. It was impossible for the Northern delegates to remain members of the council which had so changed its character, and with their withdrawal, this experiment of associating Irishmen of all parties in the practical work of local government came to an end. The history of this movement proves the hopelessness of the task which the Government have undertaken. Irish Nationalism has shown itself to be implacable, and there is not the slightest reason for hoping that the Irish Council which the Government propose to set up would display a more reasonable and practicable spirit. On the contrary, it is certain that from the very first the entire energies of the new Council would be directed not to the work of good, honest administration for the benefit of all, not to the task of developing the resources of Ireland—but to an agitation for complete Home Rule as a step towards separation. The Government and their supporters under-rate the strength and violence of the anti-British feeling which is the dominant spirit in the Nationalist movement of to-day. Every restriction upon the powers of the new Council which this Bill contains, would be used to stir up ill-will against Great Britain. Ireland would still be represented as bearing the yoke of England, and it is impossible to doubt that, if this dangerous experiment were to be carried out, all progress and development in Ireland would be swamped by a flood of political agitation. As to the consequences of the policy of the Government to the loyal minority in Ireland, I desire to speak with moderation. I do not hesitate to say, however, that rather than submit to constitutional changes which would place them under Nationalist domination, the Unionists of Ireland are prepared to resort to every means of resistance which may be open to them. This is a matter of life and death to the minority of the Irish people. Not only their material prosperity but their whole civil and religious liberties are bound up with the maintenance of the Union, and the unimpaired control by this House over the administration of Ireland. The Irish Loyalists are not a mere handful of the population. They number at least 1,250,000; and they are by no means confined to Ulster. There are over 250,000 scattered throughout the southern Irish provinces. Under the scheme which the Chief Secretary has laid before the House, these isolated Unionists would be absolutely at the mercy of their political opponents. No safeguards which this House could devise would avail to protect them from injury. The Nationalist majority would undoubtedly use the power entrusted to them without any consideration for the rights and interests of their opponents. I would ask hon. Members opposite to reflect upon the past history of the Nationalist movement. Let them consider whether in an organisation with such a record there is any possibility of toleration going hand in hand with the possession of power. Indeed, the Leader of the Nationalist Party has left us no room for doubt on this point. He has said "The handful of Protestants" in Ulster, "must be overborne by the strong hand." I know the hon. Member has tried to explain away that unfortunate but illuminating phrase. But it stands as an indication of the real spirit of the Nationalist movement towards political opponents. It is possible, that English Members fail to appreciate the full significance of this threat of the "strong hand." Unfortunately, Irish Unionists have too close, and too recent an acquaintance with the manifestations of the strong hand of the Nationalist organisations to be under any doubt of the real meaning of this expression. It is not surprising that with this menace ringing in their ears the Loyalist minority should determine, by all means in their power, to resist any approach to Home Rule. We who represent the Unionists of Ireland, see in the measure which the Chief Secretary has explained to the House, an instalment of Home Rule, which, if carried, would involve immediate ruin to Unionist interests in Ireland and be fraught with disastrous consequences to the United Kingdom and the Empire. For those reasons, we shall offer to this Bill the most strenuous opposition at every stage.

SIR ALFRED THOMAS (Glamorganshire, E.): On behalf of those Gentlemen with whom I am associated I wish to offer a word of hearty congratulation to the Chief Secretary for the very important measure which he has adumbrated this evening. We have just heard some doleful tales from hon. Members opposite of what will happen if the Bill becomes law, and the hon. Member for Mid Armagh asked us to look into the past history of the Nationalist Party. I should be very sorry to look into the past history of any political Party. The Irish people have some experience of self-government under the Local Government Act, and it seems to me that the actions and proceedings of their Councils have, except that they passed resolutions against the war, been a pattern even to our own. I know that the Bill does not make any provision for legislation, but we all know that administration is a very important part of the government of any country. Pope said—

> "For forms of government let fools contest;
> Whate'er is best administer'd is best."

This Bill gives an opportunity to Irishmen to take a part in their own administration. One hon. Member said that the Bill will not save much of the time of the House, but we all know that half of the Questions that are addressed to Ministers in the House come from Irish Members and mostly relate to administration; and if the Bill becomes law these questions as to administration will not come before the House but will be addressed to the people in Dublin who administer affairs there. This is not a Bill of magnificent dimensions, but still it is a Bill that will go far to give the people of Ireland an opportunity of showing how capable they are of administering their own affairs, and it is very pleasant for those Members with whom I am associated to know that our friends in Ireland will have this instalment of what, I think, is something very like Home Rule.

*MR. GOOCH (Bath): In considering this question Liberals are in duty bound to apply two tests. The first is whether this scheme is in accordance with our election pledges. In the second place, does it constitute a definite advance in the direction of reform of Irish administration? I think that there is not much difficulty in replying in the affirmative to both these questions. The speech of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh, seemed, if I may say so without disrespect, to have been prepared, before he heard the speech of the Chief Secretary, in anticipation of a very much more far-reaching scheme than the House has actually heard described. I think it must have struck the House that this measure is a modest one, and even the most timid Liberal can support it. I am confirmed in this opinion by referring to what was said by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. He made a remark which I venture to think will be repeated many times in this House in the course of the debates, and certainly will be quoted all over England on every platform where this question is discussed. The Opposition papers in England and Ireland have been telling their readers long before they knew what the Bill was to be that this measure, whatever its name, would be a measure designed to lead up to Home Rule, or an instalment of Home Rule under another name. The reply to that comes not from the Radical Benches, but from the Leader of the Opposition, who used remarkable words which the House will appreciate. He said that there was no resemblance between this scheme and Home Rule. ["No, No."] I took the words down. Therefore, when we hear the hon. Member for Mid Armagh saying that this is an instalment of Home Rule under another name, I think that we have a double reply. The first is as to the enabling provisions of the Bill, which do not set up a legislative machine, but merely an administrative body—a machine which cannot pass a law, which cannot levy a tax, which cannot raise a rate. The second reply is in the words used by the Leader of the Opposition to which I have referred.

I think I can say that, however timid Members were at the time of the election in refusing to pledge themselves to any far-reaching scheme of Irish reform, the proposal of the Government is so modest and moderate that there is nobody on this side of the House who will not be able to support it. I myself feel, and my hon. friends feel, that, so far from going too far, we should have liked the scheme to go a little further, and it should be strengthened in Committee, without, of course, in any way departing from the election pledges of certain Members. The second test which I propose is this: Does this Bill take a definite step in the direction of the reform of Irish administration? I must say that I was amazed to hear the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon speaking for about an hour without a single reference to the admitted anomalies of Irish administration. I should have thought that it was common property among men of all parties, among Unionists, among Devolutionists as well as Home Rulers, and among Liberals, that Irish government, as it at present exists, is full of anomalies. Lord Lansdowne said that the present system of Irish government was cumbrous and antiquated. We know what is the view of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover, who, when he was in office took the view that co-ordination of the Departments was one of the things which the Government was bound to attempt to carry out. If hon. Members will turn to Lord Dunraven's book on "The Outlook in Ireland," they will find a very interesting chapter as to the schemes and utterances of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham and the Duke of Devonshire, that is to say, the founders of the Liberal Unionist Party twenty years ago, asking for almost the same thing as the Government has now put before the House. The Leader of the Opposition in his speech to-day spoke of the administrative machine of Ireland as moving swiftly and easily, but he forgets, for instance, the long wrangles and delays between the Congested Districts Board and the National Board of Education and the Treasury. So far from Irish government working smoothly, it does not work at all, or when it does work it works exceedingly slowly. I think that those who take this view ought to make it quite clear that we are bringing no indictment against the officials of Dublin Castle or any other Government Board. It has been my good fortune to know personally a good number of permanent officials of the various Irish Departments, and I believe my view is shared by a great number of those Members of the House who have had the pleasure and privilege of making their personal acquaintance. The fault is not in the men, but in the system. I think that Ireland and Irish government have suffered, not from the officials, because they are able and honourable men, but from what certainly deserves the name of chaos, a word which the Chief Secretary did not use, but which I believe he would have been abundantly justified in using. There has been another preliminary difficulty in the minds of various speakers to-day in connection with local or administrative devolution, and that is the failure in certain respects of the Local Government Act of 1898. I think that it is unfair in estimating the effect of the Act of 1898 to concentrate attention on one aspect, and on one result and on one result alone. That, after all, is only one aspect of the work of 1898. We have heard much too little from the Unionist Benches of the undoubted absence of corruption and the misuse of money which seems to have been quite as rare in the case of the Irish county councils as it has been in this country. From the point of view of economy and efficient administration, I venture to think that on the whole Ireland has administered its powers in a more economical way. I ask hon. Members representing Ulster to consider whether we should not do the same thing over here if in a constituency at an election for the county council you had almost entirely on the list of voters Churchmen and landlords, because it is not at all likely that Churchmen and landlords would select a Radical or a Nonconformist, and still less a man who was a Radical and Nonconformist combined. I wish to say one or two words about the Bill, the undoubted merits of which I think will strike anybody who has carefully considered the machinery of Irish Government. What pleases me most in this measure is the promise to carry through a reform which is notoriously necessary, and which is considered to be necessary by men of all parties, namely,the amalgamation of the two Education Boards for elementary and secondary education. That is a question which has been discussed many times in this House. We are all acquainted with the independent position which those two Boards have occupied in the past, and we are all agreed that it is necessary that they should work in the closest possible connection. They are not only housed in different Departments and created under different statutes, but they have no sort or kind of connection one with the other. Consequently, I am absolutely delighted to find that in addition to the creation of this Council there is to be an amalgamation of these two Boards. I rejoice at the fact that Ireland is going to have an extra £650,000, and I hope that we shall not hear any grumbling from the English, Welsh or Scottish taxpayers at having to provide this sum. It has already been pointed out by the Leader of the Irish Party that the Commission on Financial Relations recommended certain reforms which have never been dealt with. This additional £650,000 to be granted to the Irish Treasury should not be regarded as a matter of money but simply as a matter of financial justice. Looking to the needs of this new Irish Council, I feel that no passage in the Chief Secretary's speech was more justified than that in which he said it would be folly or even madness to expect the Irish Council to carry on the work of these eight Departments with £2,000,000 per annum. It is no use setting up these Boards and an education office, unless they have more money to spend. I am sure hon. Members will agree that another £100,000 or even £200,000 spent upon school buildings and teachers' salaries would be wel spent, and the country would get a very good return for the money. One of the first results of the setting up of this new Council will be a permanent advance in the efficiency of Irish education. I noticed that the somewhat curious franchise which has been suggested is going to include women voters, and therefore this may be considered an enfranchising measure as well. I do not think the Council will be any the worse from the fact that it will to a certain extent represent Irish women. There was one aspect of this measure which the Leader of the Irish Party rightly called attention to, and it seems to me that unless this great block is removed the measure will not be anything like so valuable—I refer to the position of the Lord-Lieutenant. I think his position as set out in the Chief Secretary's speech is absolutely impossible. The strongest, the wisest, and the most hard-working man in the world could not possibly deal with all the duties proposed to be placed upon the Lord-Lieutenant. It is a very wrong thing that he should be expected to give the important decisions which he is supposed to give. It is unfair to the Council and to the Lord-Lieutenant, and I think it is common ground between both friends and opponents that this proposal cannot possibly stand. I hope that the Government will take the sense of their critics upon this point, and try in Committee to relieve the Lord-Lieutenant of this intolerable and unnecessary burden. We on the Ministerial Benches accept the Bill with gratitude as an instalment not of Home Rule but of good government for Ireland, and it leaves Home Rule exactly where it was before. The Government have not pledged themselves to finality, and they do not ask hon. Members from Ireland to accept it as final. Lord John Russell's famous finality speech seventy years ago, after the passage of the first Reform Bill, has now become the laughing stock of history, and he lived to regret it and recant it by being afterwards associated with more than one Reform Bill. The sole question which we have to ask ourselves is whether this is a step in the direction of the reform of Irish Government. After an impartial consideration of the question, I believe it is such a step, and I think it will bring forth the same answer from thoughtful Unionists as well as from thoughtful Liberals, and therefore I shall give it my hearty support.

*MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): The hon. Member who has just addressed the House does not seem to be aware that ever since the year 1898, ladies have had the privilege of voting in Ireland, and I am pleased to say they have discharged that duty with credit to themselves and credit to the government of the country. I do not think this is a measure which can be described as in any material degree falling short of an instalment of the larger policy leading up to Home Rule. I confess that I could not help reflecting that there seemed to be a very close and most honourably carried out understanding between the Government Front Bench and the Nationalists, that by no possible slip should this measure be received or described as in any way touching the question of Home Rule. I congratulate both the Parties I have referred to upon the honourable manner in which that compact seems to have been carried out, but it is my duty to bring the House back to certain well remembered utterances of the Prime Minister which have long justified us in looking forward to the introduction of this Bill with considerable misgivings. Whilst fully acknowledging the eloquent terms in which this measure has been brought before the House, I cannot admit, anxious as I am to get rid of that idea, that our suspicions of a compact which we believed to exist between these two Parties has been in any way removed. We find—and this shows how the Prime Minister's opinion develops with the passage of the years—on going to records the accuracy of which cannot be disputed, that in 1900 the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "If the desire for self-government continues it would best be met, in my judgment, by some scheme of devolution of business applicable to the three kingdoms alike."

But at the time of the general election the Prime Minister evidently desired to conciliate the Irish vote, and in a speech made at Stirling he said that if he were asked for advice by an ardent Irish Nationalist he would advise him to take a fulfilment of his desires in any way he could get it, that if an instalment were offered he should accept it provided "it was consistent with and led up to the larger policy." I assume that in view of this declaration the Irish Nationalists voted for Radical candidates at the last election. Now the price has to be paid, no doubt reluctantly. I remember a famous speech of the hon. Member for North Louth in which he said that when the Nationalist Party did anything to help another political Party their price had to be paid. Probably if the Radical Party had been able to foresee the great majority they would obtain at the General Election the Prime Minister would have been more judicious in his language. I hold moderate views, but at the same time I hold very sincerely the Unionist convictions held by the bulk of the people in the North of Ireland, and as a Unionist I have no option but to offer the Bill my most strenuous opposition. I feel that there lies behind this innocent looking Bill a serious intention to do a very grave injustice to the best interests of Ireland. If there is one thing which Irishmen who live in their native land and others who have gone to live there are proud of, it is the success of that splendid modern development the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. The antipathy of the Nationalist Party to that Department is very well known. I remember Sir Horace Plunkett preaching the gospel of self-help and the revival of Irish industries by co-operative exertions. He was said to be a dreamer of vain dreams, but the time came when Sir Horace by his sincerity and by his zeal succeeded in obtaining the support of some of the best and most thoughtful men in Ireland. The result is that, whereas at first there were only 800 technical students in Ireland, at present there are something like 42,000. I speak with some knowledge of the Department's operations, because the county I have the honour to represent has received the greatest possible benefit from its schemes. I am all the more pleased to say this because I have at times criticised some details of the Department's operations as strongly as others have done. The work of the Department has been performed under the greatest possible difficulty. On behalf of the Nationalist Party the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Waterford said it was undermining the influence of that Party. I say God speed to it if it is so doing. The hon. Member for East Mayo has preached the same thing. If it was so, I thought when I read his speech that Sir Horace Plunkett was doing a better work than

I had ever realised before. I hope the House will remember with gratitude the great work Sir Horace has done, and I am proud to know that the work will go on though he ceases to be at the head of the Department. Under the wise guidance of the Department the value of the flax crop in Ulster was a quarter of a million more last year than the crop of five years ago. It has been brought about by educating the Irish people by means of Dutch experts, who were brought to Ireland to teach the people a few years ago. I refer to this great Department because I believe that the aim and scope of this measure is to undermine its usefulness. We are to have a new Council which will be largely composed of members of the Nationalist Party; and I challenge the members of that Party to deny that they disapprove of the operations of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. There are other parts of the Bill which cause us in the North of Ireland very serious anxiety. There is the case of education. I am very sorry to say that I fear there is no hope for education in Ireland being brought up to the standard of Scottish education so long as you hand it over to what is called a popularly elected body. I am sorry to make that observation. It is often alleged that Ulster Unionists refuse all public offices to Nationalists. I believe that in the county council of which I am a member we have five Nationalists and sixteen Unionists, and for five years a Nationalist has been elected vice-chairman. I admit that I opposed that gentleman's re-election as a Nationalist—not because I objected to give the Nationalists a minority representation, but because we had that peculiar brand of Nationalist who was pulling wires in Dublin Castle to get elected a member of the Grand Jury and at the same time resuscitating a branch of the United Irish League. [NATIONALIST cries of "Name."] It is unnecessary to give the name. I remember that at an early period we had a Roman Catholic chairman of an urban district council of which I was a member, although the Nationalists in the council numbered only three out of eighteen. As to the composition of the proposed Council, I cannot congratulate the right hon. Gentleman on the fairness of his scheme of representation. He has told us that we are going to have four representatives from Belfast and four from Dublin; but I would remind him that there is a startling difference in the population of the two cities. Then he proposes to give two representatives to some of the counties in the North of Ireland, while two representatives are also to be given to counties in the South and West, which have only half the population of those in Ulster. It has been said by the right hon. Gentleman that "minorities must suffer, it is the badge of their tribe." But I should have thought that as one professedly anxious to deal justly even with minorities the right hon. Gentleman would have taken a larger view of our special circumstances in the constitution of this new body, a body which I venture to prophesy will never get the length of working. It is disappointing that he should have proposed to continue the gross under-representation of Unionist opinion in Ireland. There are hon. Members sitting below the gangway who represent only a fifth of the population I represent. I hope that that part of the Bill will be recast, and that when we get to the Second Reading every opportunity will be afforded us, as we have not had to-day, to discuss this measure in full detail—a measure which, I repeat, I have no doubt, has been carefully designed to lead up to the larger policy of Home Rule and to pay the price of the support of Nationalists in England and Scotland at the last general election.

*MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR: I am certain that every English Member addressing the House on such a question as Irish administration and the constitution and power of the Irish Government must feel considerable hesitation in plunging into an arena of political affairs which is more complicated than any other before the House. English Members may be excused from taking part in the ordinary course of debates on matters affecting Irish administration; but when it is proposed to take from this House certain powers which it has hitherto exercised, the case is altered. I feel that on most questions, and particularly on this question, I stand possibly in a freer position as regards the Party point of view than most other Members in the House. When I sat on the other side of the House I was not a Home Ruler, and the fact that I have crossed the House and find myself seated and associated with hon. Gentlemen with whom I am more in accord than with the Unionist Party does not alter my position in that respect. I remain on this side of the House as I was on the other, opposed to Home Rule as I understand it, and as it has been described to-day by the hon. and learned Member for Waterford—a separate Parliament for Ireland with a separate executive responsible to it, carrying out the expressed and declared wishes of the Irish people. There is an idea of giving to Scotland, Ireland, and Wales a Parliament equipped as in the self-governing Colonies. That has never appealed to me as likely to lead to the efficiency of the government of this country or to the integrity and efficiency of the Empire. My attitude arises from no want of sympathy with hon. Gentlemen below the gangway opposite in their aspirations after a complete expression of nationality. No one in this House sympathises more than I do with the conception of obtaining the greatest possible future for a nation. If I am unable to do anything but oppose the ideas of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway it is only because that larger country which has this Parliament as its governing body demands that the idea of Irish nationality should not be pressed too hard. The Bill before us has been described, both by the right hon. Gentleman and by the Irish Leader, as in no sense a Home Rule Bill; and I take it that really the issue before the House is not so much whether this is or is not a Home Rule Bill, on which we could consume a good deal of time in an academic discussion, but whether this is or is not the best way of re-constructing a system of government which, by common consent, is held not to be as efficient as it might be, and which may justly be described as a hindrance to the development and prosperity of Ireland. I listened with interest to the quotations read by my right hon. friend in his opening speech of some remarks made by the Duke of Devonshire in 1885, upon the possibility of re-constructing Dublin Castle government somewhat on the lines of this Bill. I do not know whether my right hon. friend ever took the trouble to look up Mr. Gladstone's reply to the Duke of Devonshire. Perhaps, however, it is hardly fair in a debate of this kind to go too extensively into the speeches of the past. It would be a very easy matter to rake up speeches of twenty years ago and to prove, not only from the lips of Mr. Gladstone, but from the lips of the present Prime Minister, that any Bill which touches the administrative side only in connection with Ireland and which does not touch the legislative side is a Bill which ought not to receive the assent of this House. I hold extracts in my hand which I will not weary the House with reading, but the House may take it from me as incontrovertible, that during the defence of the Home Rule Bill of 1886, both Mr. Gladstone and the Prime Minister said that a Bill which only reconstructed the Government of Ireland on the administrative side and left the legislative side untouched, was one which would be found impracticable in the working and unsatisfactory as far as the wishes of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway opposite are concerned. But I really think the speeches of statesmen twenty years ago, under conditions of controversy which are entirely different from those we have to face to-day and under conditions in Ireland which are different, are not germane to the present Bill, and need not be quoted at length. The admitted problem before the House is the bringing into a state of efficiency the administration of the Government in Ireland. My right hon friend the Chief Secretary, as many other speakers in this House have done, has pointed to the multiplicity of Boards in Ireland and the irresponsibility of those Boards, and to the impossibility, in considering the question of Irish administration, of maintaining the system of departmental administration, coupled with responsibility in this House, without devising some scheme with an elective element as is suggested in this Bill. I do not know whether I can make my position clear to the House, but I feel that if you are reforming the administration as practical men, there are only two really satisfactory solutions before you. Either you must follow the precedent of Scotland, where you have a system of Departmental administration carried out by the Secretary for Scotland, in sympathy with the wishes of the people of Scotland, so that it makes for efficiency and national well-being, or you must refer to the model of the Colonial Governments and abandon altogether the idea of revision in this House through the Secretary of State of the administration in different parts of the United Kingdom, and create in the different parts of the United Kingdom a fully responsible and separate Parliament with a separate executive. This Bill does neither the one thing nor the other. I want to speak quite frankly to hon. Members below the gangway. With their desire to do everything which will make for the happiness of everyone in Ireland, no one has greater sympathy than myself. The situation in Ireland is not so different to that of Scotland, if the Irish people were willing to be dealt with in a similar manner, and that is really at the root of the difficulty. Our difficulty in Ireland is not a question of natural conditions, but a question of sympathy. [Hear, hear.] Yes; but questions of sympathy are things which require the most delicate treatment that any statesman can give to them. If the Irish people were willing, it is not impossible to imagine a peaceful and contented Ireland with the hon. Member for Waterford as Chief Secretary, catering for the material, moral, and spiritual needs of that country. The obstacle in the way of that, as I have said before, is the sentiment of the Irish people, and it is because the Government recognise that opinion in England will not tolerate a Parliament either in Ireland, or Scotland, or Wales, upon the model of the Colonies, and on the other hand, they recognise that Irish sentiment will not accept and sympathise with the system of Departments, and the sympathetic system as it prevails in Scotland, that they are driven to produce this measure which divorces from the purview of this House these six or eight Departments of government. You then have this anomalous position, that while the Parliament in England is absolutely responsible for the collection and the raising of the finances for these Departments, another body, a representative body—though not altogether representative, because there is this nominated element which my right hon. friend has introduced—but still a representative body in Ireland is to have the disbursing and control of these funds. I am sure that no Member of this House on either side, if he were free to choose his ideal, would commit the destinies of Ireland to such a system. I feel that if we endorse a scheme of this kind, we are endorsing something which requires considerable explanation, and if for my part, I vote for the First Reading of this Bill, it is only because I think that any measure produced under circumstances such as these, and designed, as I believe this is, to secure, if possible, peace in Ireland (a country to which by birth and sentiment I am deeply attached), deserves respectful treatment and consideration from this House, and every portion of it. In regard to the position of the Lord-Lieutenant, it seems to me that it is nothing less than the veto of the Imperial Parliament applied in a peculiar way. Surely if the Imperial Parliament is to have a veto at all, it must be applied through some channel, and if the Lord-Lieutenant is to be that channel, he will have the sense of the Cabinet behind him. It will then be open to hon. Members to challenge his action in this House, and I can quite imagine that they will do so. It will then be for the Chief Secretary for Ireland, among his other congenial occupations, to get up and justify the action of the Lord-Lieutenant in interfering with the first representative council with which Ireland has become acquainted. In regard to the eight Departments which are now represented by my right hon. friend, and which are no longer, I understand, to have official representation in this House suppose some legislative change is required in particular matters which affect those Departments, it is this House which will have to deal with those Bills, and it is my right hon. friend who will have to take charge of them. Therefore I should like to know from my right hon. friend whether really he will find himself in the future less likely to be held responsible for the general administration of law in Ireland in regard to questions from both sides of the House by the action or inaction of this new body. I ask whether we do really get rid of so large a slice of Irish administration, and if we are not proposing a new Board in Ireland to take the place of the existing Boards, which my right hon. friend might some day complain of as being more than human nature can stand. I have not made these remarks in any spirit of malicious criticism of the project of the Government. I desire that any proposals in regard to Irish administration should receive fair criticism, and I hope I have not gone beyond the limits of reasonable criticism in pointing out the inherent anomalies that a half-way house of this kind contains. I feel strongly that securities for the minority in Ireland should be inserted in the Bill. If on examination they are not found to be of such a character as will sufficiently protect the minority, I strongly feel that in view of the religious differences in Ireland every care should be taken by this House to safeguard the interests of the Protestant minority. I welcome the declaration of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford, which I hope this House will see carried out by all the force at its command, that he at any rate is prepared to go as far as it is possible for man to go with due regard to reason and common sense in the direction of securing the rights of conscience and liberty to every Irishman who may ultimately be affected by the Bill before the House.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University): There is such an air of mystery about the proceedings of to-night, that I feel it must have struck not merely hon. Members on this side, but hon. Gentlemen opposite who are not "in the know," that a treaty has been arrived at between the Government and hon. Gentlemen below the gangway upon this subject.

Mr. BIRRELL: There is no treaty whatever.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL: That makes the mystery all the greater. No one is more capable of making perfectly clear the meaning of his proposals in this House, but on this occasion very few have been able to follow the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. BIRRELL: That is not my fault.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL: It seemed to me that he troubled so little about the matter that he did not trouble to think out the details. What was the anxiety of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway? For the last year and a half Irish Nationalist papers have been proclaiming that, owing to the advent of the present Government to office, they were on the eve of attaining the fruition of the hopes they have entertained for so many years, and hon. Members have proclaimed in their organs and speeches that the irreducible minimum in satisfaction of their demands is a Parliament in Ireland, with an Executive responsible thereto. When certain estimable but rather weak-minded gentlemen in Ireland thought they could form a Moderate Party to engineer a policy of devolution—a modified form of Home Rule—they were received with derision by all Members. Mr. Michael Davitt said the devolution proposals were a mere matter of form, and the hon. Member for East Mayo denounced them in most animated terms. He said the proposals were preposterous and utterly unworkable, and that if set up, they would not last six months, and if put up in the House of Commons would not last a night's debate. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has introduced proposals which are to a certain extent mild proposals in the form of devolution, and yet the hon. and learned Member for Waterford, the Leader of the Nationalist Party in this House, instead of standing up as I expected he would, and making the rafters ring with his denunciations of the treachery of the Government, who had once more broken faith with the Irish Party—instead of uttering these warnings and threats with which in these debates we have grown familiar, has spoken to-night in the accents of a sucking dove, and says he is going to reserve his criticisms and his ultimate vote on these proposals until they have been laid before a convention of the Irish people. That seems to suggest an understanding, and we have not heard from the right hon. Gentleman what is the nature of the understanding that exists between him and the hon. Member for Waterford on this matter. The large sheaf of notes from which the hon. and learned Member spoke showed he had evidently some information with regard to this Bill, and that the disclosures of the right hon. Gentleman were not the only source of information from which he was speaking. Does anyone in this House know what treaty exists, and what is the meaning of the remarkable unanimity we saw here to-night, when one hon. Member below the gangway, who was recently in the United States, is stated by the *Freeman's Journal* to have said to a large assembly in the United States a month ago, that "in a few weeks Home Rule was to be granted to Ireland?" Almost every day for the last twelve months the Nationalist newspapers of Ireland have been proclaiming that we are on the eve of a settlement of this question. The hon. Member for Waterford and other hon. Members below the gangway have declared again and again during the last twelve months that whatever the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman might be, if they fell short of the irreducible minimum of a separate Parliament they would not accept them. What is the reason of the reprieve? How is it that these milk-and-water proposals have raised no denunciations? To my mind it suggests that there is more in this matter than has been brought to light. I cannot profess to say whether the Government intend to treat this Bill in Committee as they have treated other Bills in this Parliament, and turn these harmless proposals into an effective measure of Home Rule, or whether they have brought them in with a knowledge or a conviction that they will be rejected in Ireland when they will be able to say: "Those of us who spoke of a policy of Home Rule by instalments can justify ourselves by saying 'We brought it in,' and those of us who look on this as an academic question can say, 'We were right, because the proposals were so mild that the Irish rejected them.'" The extraordinary thing about the proposals is that they settle nothing and satisfy nobody. There is no finality about them, and their introduction marks the beginning of a new chapter of that unfortunate religious and sectarian strife that has so long distracted and destroyed the energies of Ireland. Speaking for myself, I attach very little importance to pledges and promises that are given that any proposal introduced for the purpose of dealing with so-called Irish grievances is to be the basis of a settlement or a final settlement. In my short experience in this House I have seen introduced several important measures each of which was heralded as a settlement of the land problem in Ireland. In 1903 there was passed in this House a great scheme of land purchase which was heralded as a settlement of the land question, under which the British people pledged themselves to grant a loan of £100,000,000 and a bonus of £12,000,000. Within the last few weeks there was introduced into this House by an hon. Gentleman below the Gangway a Bill which received the blessing of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary and his Attorney-General, the very purpose of which was to tear to shreds that so-called final settlement, to abolish the voluntary system, and to introduce by-laws to sweep away zones which were intended as a protection. Therefore I attach very little importance indeed to promises or pledges that any particular measure will be accepted by my fellow countrymen at home as a final settlement. They know the game much better than that. They take what they can get; they pretend that it does not please them; they pretend that it is a miserable substitute for what they really desire; but they take it and then they ask for more. Even if the hon. and learned Gentleman gave to the House any assurance of this sort, that any such measure as this could or would possibly be accepted as a reasonable fulfilment of the pledges of His Majesty's Government, such an assurance coming from him would be made in perfect good faith as anyone who knows the hon. and learned Gentleman will realise; but there are powers and forces behind the hon. and learned Gentleman which he is absolutely incapable of controlling or restraining. I think hon. Gentlemen below the gangway will do me the justice to say that I have never publicly or professionally in any way maligned my fellow countrymen; I have never been guilty of any form of expression intolerant towards my fellow countrymen in any part of Ireland. These proposals are fraught with great good or great evil for the future of the country, and it is the duty of Members for Irish constituencies, and representing Irish interests, to speak out with frankness. There is in existence at the present day, running to a certain degree on parallel lines with the Parliamentary movement represented by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Waterford, but far more extreme and dangerous for the security of Irish credit, Irish trade, and Irish prosperity, than that with which the hon. and learned Gentleman is associated, the movement known as the *Sinn Fein*, or "Ireland for ourselves." It is taking from hon. Gentlemen below the gangway followers day by day. If hon. Members below the gangway accept the scheme as a fulfilment of the promise of the Prime Minister the *Sinn Fein* will take the field against them. The programme of that body is first an absolute boycott in Ireland of all goods of English manufacture; secondly, to pay no Imperial taxes of any kind; thirdly, an anti-enlisting crusade in every department of His Majesty's Service; fourthly, an absolute boycott of the English tongue. The leader of the movement has described the English language as being only fit for a flunkey, and the kind of language which no one but a slave in Ireland would use. This movement has already got its newspapers; it has a newspaper in Belfast which is called *The Republic*, and within the last few weeks it has published an article in which it says—

> "The absolute independence of Ireland is Ireland's right. We ask for no more, and we will take no less."

There is also a paper which I have never read, called *The Peasant*, which was formerly known as *The Irish Peasant*, and which is published in Dublin. What does this paper say as to the suggestion of the hon. and learned Gentleman for Waterford for calling a convention to consider what reception should be given to the proposals of His Majesty's Government? Hear what it says—

> "A National Convention, we are told, will be called to discuss the Bill about to be introduced to the House of Commons; but surely Mr. Redmond does not imagine that he can have a National Convention which will be open to his own followers alone. Such a Convention will only be trifling with the affairs of the nation."

I only mention these facts to show that whatever desire the hon. and learned Gentleman and his followers may have to give a pledge or promise in connection with this Bill, there are forces behind him and above him which he cannot control or command. And what about Irish feeling in America? We know that the Nationalist Party have to depend on America for their funds, and we know that in America the idea and the dream of every Irish Nationalist is, not these devolution proposals of the right hon. Gentleman, not even a separate Parliament with an Executive responsible to it, but an independent and separate nation. While I would be the last to suggest, and I do not suggest, that the hon. and learned Gentleman has ever said out of this House anything that he has not had the courage to say inside, yet at the same time it is right in this House to remember, and he would be the last to deny it, that he has to keep alive the spirit of his Party at home with constant references to those delegations which are sent to America, and constant references to what he believes, and those who think with him believe, will be the real result of the Irish movement, and that is not merely a separate Parliament, but an absolutely separate and independent nation. Let me say a word as to these proposals of the right hon. Gentleman. [MINISTERIAL cheers]. I presume hon. Members opposite, who are so free with their cheers, were well acquainted before this evening with the nature of these proposals. I had not that advantage, and my knowledge of them is derived from listening to the right hon. Gentleman's effort to explain them. So far as I can understand them they involve the handing over to this new Council the management and administration of eight of the existing departments of Irish Government. There are some of these that they can do very little harm at. Take for example the Congested Districts Board. That is a board which has been doing, and is doing, excellent work, and why it should be interfered with I cannot for the life of me understand. That board was appointed practically to administer a fund for charitable purposes. Take as another example the Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department. This body is to be revolutionised and re-organised and upset in the midst of its best and most active work, and I cannot understand why it should be. This is a new department engaged in new work, and it is not carrying on any system which up to the time of its creation had existed before. And what about these Education Boards? What about the board entrusted with the management of national education? What about the board entrusted with the supervision of intermediate education in Ireland? There is no more controversial and difficult question that can be suggested for this new Council than the control and management of Irish primary education. So difficult and delicate is that task, owing to the determination of all classes and creeds in Ireland to run their schools on denominational lines, that from the very first it has been recognised that the only method by which this can be carried out so as to secure fair treatment for all creeds is to have a Board with an equal number of Protestant and Catholic members. The same thing has been done in the case of the Intermediate Education Board, and there are upon these boards Roman Catholic and Protestant gentlemen of the highest position and intelligence who give gratuitously their time and ability to carry on this difficult and most delicate work. Does anyone imagine that the gentlemen who constitute these boards will submit to being controlled in the carrying out of their duties by this Council? The thing is preposterous, and they will resign in a body. And who will you put in their places? The Roman Catholic hierarchy have passed resolutions against the dissolution of the National Board. Are you now going to re-model primary education upon any basis that will not be acceptable to the Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy? Everyone knows that it is ludicrous to leave them out of the matter. What are you going to substitute? You are going to substitute a Council two-thirds of which will always be a Catholic majority over a minority of Protestants? There must inevitably be, owing to the system of registration and the electorate, large Roman Catholic majorities. ["Why not?"] Past experience has shown the absolute necessity of having education, both primary and secondary, administered by boards consisting of members of both faiths. What reason is there for upsetting that arrangement in order to set up a board two-thirds of which will be able to dictate to the minority? I would like to say a word or two about the alleged intolerant opposition of Irish Unionists in Ireland to all proposals for the amelioration of Irish Government. Has it ever occurred to hon. Gentlemen opposite who belong to the Nonconformist bodies to ask themselves why it is that every single one of their co-religionists in Ireland is a Unionist? Have they ever asked any Scottish or English commercial gentlemen who have gone over to reside in Ireland if they have ever suffered from the tyranny of the British Government? If they were asked they would tell you that they lived under the same laws and enjoyed the same freedom and liberty as they did in this country, and if they have ever had any interference with their civil or religious liberty it certainly did not come from the representatives of His Majesty's Government. These considerations suggest themselves when we are asked why it is that we cannot entrust our civil and religious rights to the administration of a Council which will have a permanent majority of Nationalists and of those who differ from us not merely in politics but also in religion. Hon. Gentlemen representing England or Scotland have no idea of the extent to which religion enters into the daily, social, and industrial life of Ireland. I am not saying whose fault it is, and I assume that there is fault on both sides, but we have to face the fact. When the Local Government Bill was passed for Ireland we received assurances that every Unionist and Protestant would be gladly welcomed, and that their services would be requisitioned in the south and west of Ireland. What has been the result? It has now become the boast of hon. Gentlemen below the gangway that the whole scheme of local government in Ireland has become a Nationalist organisation. The hon. and learned Member for Waterford in 1904 said that if the Government were to strike at their political organisation the work of the Nationalist Party would be carried on in the county councils and the district councils. It has been claimed by them, and they are entitled to claim credit for it, that they have mastered and got possession of the entire system of local government in Ireland for the purpose of political agitation. I am not ashamed to say it. I regret it, but the fact has been almost universal that throughout the west and south of Ireland men professing Unionist and Protestant principles have been rigorously excluded from any part or lot in the administration of local affairs. Not only that, but the Roman Catholic hierarchy have issued declarations calling upon local bodies not only not to select any Protestants but to select only Roman Catholic officials of a particular sect. [NATIONALIST cries of "No."] I am stating what I know. I am speaking of what I have read, and I will give hon. Members a concrete case which all below the gangway will recognise. In the Claremorris District Council there was a vacancy for a clerk to the council. The local Catholic clergy met and passed a resolution that no man was to be appointed unless he brought a certificate from his parish priest. Among the candidates was the brother of the Member for one of the divisions of Mayo, but because he did not bring a certificate from his parish priest he was scouted from the place, and someone who had the imprimatur of the parish clergyman obtained the appointment. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Was he a Protestant?] No, he was not. I quite agree that they are not so exclusive as that, I quite agree that the boycott and exclusion is extended not merely to Protestants, but even to those of their own faith who differ from them in politics. I think hon. Members below the gangway are aware of that.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to ask him a question. He made the serious statement that the members of the hierarchy in Ireland had issued appeals that no Protestant should be elected to district or other popularly elected councils. I ask the right hon. Gentleman to give a single instance in which a member of the hierarchy ever made such a request.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: What I did say was that as regards certain appointments the hierarchy, by their pastorals and otherwise, had called upon people to act in that way. Does it make it any better to call upon the local authorities in choosing their medical officers, not merely to select Roman Catholics, but absolutely to select Roman Catholics educated in a particular medical school, not merely to the exclusion of Protestants, but of Roman Catholics educated in any medical school except the one they choose?

[The right hon. and learned Gentleman read a passage from a letter by the late Mr. Michael Davitt, published in the *Freeman's Journal* in 1904, on the subject of Irish education, and referring to the interference of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in that as well as in other matters.]

That was the language of Mr. Michael Davitt, and I think I am clearly entitled to refer to it. I would like to say—and I am sure that hon. Members below the gangway will do me the justice to accept the statement—that all my present interests and all my future interests are centred in Ireland. It is not only my native country, but the country to which I am attached by affection, and I think hon. Members will give me credit for the quality of patriotism at least. If I thought I could find in these proposals anything that would be for the ultimate prosperity of the greater portion of the inhabitants of Ireland, I would be quite prepared to sacrifice any personal views I have on the matter and give it my most cordial support; but I confess that I find it impossible to do that. In the first place there is no finality, or any pretence at finality, about these proposals. On the contrary, they will produce a war of religious and sectarian strife in Ireland; because I may tell hon. Gentlemen opposite that these proposals will be considered in Ulster, as the hon. Member for South Tyrone said of somewhat similar though more exaggerated proposals, in 1893, as a matter of life and death. "They will fight them—" I am quoting what the hon. Member said in 1893.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: That is a long time ago.

Mr. JAMES CAMPBELL: The hon. Member said—

> "They will fight them, and I will fight them line by line and clause by clause."

Well, Ulster has not changed its views as regards its attitude towards proposals of this kind. They are fraught with, I believe, disaster to the country, because they will paralyse industry, for the best of all reasons—that they will deter and dismay English credit. [Laughter.] Those who laugh are those who forget very easily. They forget what the effect of the introduction of the Home Rule proposals was on the money market in 1886 and 1893, and they forget what in the few months that have elapsed since this Bill was talked of has been the effect on industrial securities in Ireland. But as one who remembers these things I certainly share the opposition to this Bill. As I have said, there is absolutely no finality about it. It will satisfy no class or section of the Irish people. It will be a bitter disappointment to Irish Nationalists who have been led to believe by their organs and leaders that they were on the eve of some great settlement of the question of Home Rule. It will be bitterly and sturdily contested by Unionists in Ireland for the simple reason that right hon. Gentlemen opposite are pledged to it not on its own merits, but as an instalment leading up to the "larger policy." I noticed in the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman that, while he was quite free to say that neither he nor his followers would accept it as a substitute for Home Rule, he was careful to abstain from saying that they were not prepared to accept it as an instalment of Home Rule, and as leading up to the "larger policy"—a policy which we Unionists believe to be prejudicial to the best interests of our country. We, therefore, will give it our most relentless opposition.

*The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Redmond Barry, Tyrone, N.): My apology for taking part in this debate to-night is the fact that I am connected with the Government of Ireland, and that I have also the great honour to represent a constituency in Ulster. I am here on the part of my constituents to raise my voice in favour of the proposals contained in this Bill. I find it rather hard to estimate the exact basis of the opposition of hon. Gentlemen opposite to the Bill. Two hon. Members for Ulster denounced the Bill as Home Rule in disguise, and two other Gentlemen opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, declared in a notable pronouncement that under no circumstances could the Bill be converted into a Home Rule Measure.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I said nothing of the sort.

*MR. REDMOND BARRY: I certainly understood that to be the effect of the right hon. Gentleman's speech. My right hon. friend who has just spoken referred to the measure as a harmless one or apparently as a harmless one, but, having a somewhat sinister cast of mind, he spoke of it as the result of some private treaty between the Government and the National Irish Members. I am astonished that my right hon. friend on a great occasion like this, in reference to a measure intended to bring relief to Ireland, should guide his actions solely by reference to some supposed treaty or arrangement existing between the Government and the Nationalist Members. On the part of the Government I may tell my right hon. friend that that apprehension, if really entertained by him, has no foundation in fact. This measure is presented to the acceptance of the House solely on its own merits, and not because of any private arrangement between the Nationalist Members and the Government. What is proposed by the measure? It proposes to deal with eight Departments which are closely identified with the administration of the government of Ireland. It places these Departments under the control of a Council most of the members of which are to be elected and some nominated by the Lord-Lieutenant. It involves no legislative proposals. There is not a single provision in the Bill under which the Council established under it will have authority to pass a law, great or small. It is a Bill purely administrative in its scope. I ask my right hon. friend with what sense of responsibility he can then get up and say that the passing of such a Bill will inaugurate religious strife in Ireland? I shall not answer an argument of that kind, and I am sorry that my right hon. friend should have been the person to introduce the element of religious dissension and discord into the debate. I should have thought that the House had become weary of arguments of that kind. How does the Bill touch religion or in any way endanger the fate of any faith or creed in Ireland? [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh,"] Speaking as an Irishman and as a Catholic, I feel that it is a humiliating thing that, forsooth, my right hon. friend should suggest that if a measure of this kind is passed, within twenty-four hours you would have the members of the various creeds in Ireland practically at each others' throats. We who live in Ireland and know it appreciate the hollowness of that argument. We know that there is no foundation for it, and it is humiliating to find such arguments advanced in this House by hon. Gentlemen from Ireland. The proposal of the Government aims at no class. Its sole object is to bring the Irish people into touch with the government of the country, to collect the powers of the various Departments and bring them under the control of a representative Council of which however tweny-four members will be nominated. It is our wish to give the people confidence in and respect for the Government of the country, and to inspire them with a respect for the administration which, unfortunately, does not at present exist. Is not that a worthy object? My right hon. friend suggested that the minority which exists in Ireland will find no representation on the Council.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL: I never suggested that they would have no representation; but I said that they would be in a permanent minority.

*MR. REDMOND BARRY: In a permanent minority! That is due to a circumstance over which the Government has no control. It is an extraordinary ground of complaint against either the government or the people of Ireland that, in the case of a people among whom Catholics are in a large preponderance they will find in an elected body in the ordinary course of things more Catholics than Protestants. I entirely dispute and repudiate the idea that the people of Ireland will elect their representatives to representative councils only on the view that the men are Catholics or Protestants. My belief is that the people will elect their representatives apart from questions of creed, and solely by reference to their opinion on the great public questions of the day. [OPPOSITION Cries of "Oh, oh."] In order to meet the apprehension of my right hon. friend opposite, a provision has been introduced into the Bill which I should have thought would have given satisfaction to him, namely, the introduction into the Council of twenty-four nominated members. I myself to-night noticed with great pleasure the declaration which the hon. Member for Waterford made as to his acquiescence with regard to the nominated element on this Council. He was quite ready, speaking on behalf of the great majority of representatives of Ireland, to submit to any provision in this Bill the object of which would be to secure the representation of the Unionist minority on the Council. That I should have thought might have been received with satisfaction by hon. Gentlemen opposite; but what is their answer? My right hon. friend spoke for half an hour before he came to consider the proposals of the Bill. His speech lasted half an hour more and left the proposals on one side. What part of the Bill does he object to? Does he suggest that there is no need for reform in Ireland? I do not understand that he takes that view. Without pressing the point that they contemplated any particular scheme, the right hon. Gentleman and his friends did apparently meditate some reform in the government of Ireland. My right hon. friend could scarcely deny that the need exists. The Government believe it exists, and come forward with this proposal to meet a state of affairs in Dublin which in their view demands some measure of this sort. What is the answer to it all? The sole answer my right hon. friend is able to make is founded on distrust on his part—rooted and permanent distrust of the people in Ireland. He looks forward to no future time, to no period when it will be safe to pass some such measure as this. He cannot tell us whether in forty or fifty years the state of Ireland will justify such a measure. He has no hope now or in the future whether such a Bill as this can be given to the people of Ireland without the danger of the power being abused. We take no such view. We believe the time is ripe for this measure; that this is a measure which no rational man can object to. It admits the people to a share in the administration of the country by giving them control over the eight departments specified. The power of action in certain cases reserved to the Lord-Lieutenant is designed merely to meet the case of a deadlock. The Government, while not absolutely committed to the form of the proposal, make it in the interest of the public service, and to prevent the public business from coming to a standstill. These are practically the important features of the Bill which we commend to the acceptance of the House. I do not believe when the House comes to consider it on its merits it will take the view that some hon. Members suggest. We believe it will be seen to be a moderate proposal to deal with a grievance admittedly existing in Ireland. I believe that when those whom the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Waterford specially represents come to consider this Bill calmly and quietly they will welcome it and will see in it proposals that will afford Irishmen a future career and an opportunity of taking a useful part in the government of their own country, thereby acquiring that moral improvement which results from the exercise of government. They will see in it also proposals that will go some way, at least, to relieve the burden under which Ireland has too long suffered

**Mr. WALTER LONG** (Dublin, S.): I am sure we all welcome the appearance of the hon. and learned Gentleman, and we realise that, whatever we may think of his defence of this Bill, he has abundantly realised the expectations we have formed as to the part he would take in our debates. But so far in this debate we have had no answer even from the hon. and learned Gentleman to the questions put from this side of the House with regard to this measure. The hon. and learned Gentleman has contented himself with attacking my right hon. and learned friend the Member for Dublin University, and in stating in broad and general terms what is the object of this measure. We are not concerned with the object of the Government or the object of the measure. What we are concerned with is, Are the methods by which the Government seek to attain their object likely to be in the smallest degree successful? The hon. and learned Gentleman has found great fault with my right hon. and learned friend because he made reference to possible religious controversies, and he asked what is there in this Bill which can possibly lead to religious controversy. Well, the hon. Member for Armagh has asked a question of first-rate importance, and the debates on this stage of the Bill cannot close, and ought not to close until that question has been answered. What was the legacy left by the late Chief Secretary to his successor? What was the last speech he made before he left Ireland to go to America? It was a speech in which he declared what was to be the policy of the Government in regard to University education in Ireland. My hon. and learned friend very properly asked, Will the powers in regard to education that the Government are going to confer upon this new body apply also to higher education, and will they enable the Council to set up a University or not? No answer has been made, and the hon. and learned Gentleman contented himself with asking what is there in this Bill which can possibly raise religious controversy? I answer at once that there is this proposal to alter and control the education of Ireland, for we do not know whether these proposals relate to higher education as well. [Mr. BIRRELL was understood to say that they did not.] In that case, all that the new body will be able to do will be to deal with elementary and intermediate education.

**Mr. BIRRELL**: That will absorb all the money they have got.

**Mr. WALTER LONG**: That is exactly the point. We have asked, in regard to higher education, whether it will be possible out of these funds to make such changes in the administration as will enable them to set by money to be applied to a particular purpose, and the right hon. Gentleman's answer is that all the money allowed to this body will be taken up by the work they have now to perform. Then what is the greatness of this change, and where is the great trust in the people of Ireland? Apart from the education question, the most important change made by the Bill is the transfer to the new Council of the work now done by the

Chief Secretary and heads of the departments in Ireland, and I take it that the whole of the Civil servants of Ireland, many of whom the right hon. Gentleman has had in eloquent terms to defend against attacks made upon them by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, are to be handed over to this National Council. The right hon. Gentleman said, "We reserve to them their rights in regard to pension; we protect them, as they have been protected before, under Local Government Acts." Yes, but in the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford there was a remark pregnant of possible results for the Civil servants. He, speaking with the full responsibility of the Leader of the Nationalist Party, warned the Government that they must not, in this new Education Department, appoint a permanent official with whom the Council, when it comes into existence, will find itself so dissatisfied that it will be compelled at once to remove him. That is a bad omen for the public work that is to be done by this council, and it holds out a poor prospect for these Civil servants, against whom it is an act of gross injustice to transfer them to those who have never concealed their hostility towards them.

Mr. Birrell rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 417; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 161.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S)
Barry, Redmond J (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Willi'ms (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Ch'shire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm J (St. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness

Dunn,A.Edward(Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,RtHnHerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood,G.(Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth,CecilB.(Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazelton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert T.Arnold(Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman (Somers't,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison

Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,AlfredJohn(Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,EdmundG.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea,HughCecil(S.Pancras,E.)
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever,W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George,Rt.Hon.David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna,Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Lanuceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)

Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts,Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal,(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor,James (Wicklow,W.
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson,SirW.D.(Colchester)
Pearson,W.H.M (Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philips,OwenC.(Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W. E. B.(Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richard,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts,Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts,John H.(Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J.M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.

Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel,HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,Charles Edw.(Stafford)
Shaw,Rt.Hon.T.(Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth,ThomasF.(Leitrim,S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D.(Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T,
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor,TheodoreC.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury
Tennant,H.J.(Berwickshire)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somers't,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,SirJohnL.(Leeds,S.)
Ward,John(StokeuponTrent
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner,ThomasCourtenayT.
Wason,Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White,J.D.(Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White,Patrick(Meath,North)
Whitley,JohnHenry(Halifax)
Whittaker,SirThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn-Carmarth'n
Williams,Osmond(Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson,J.H.(Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHnA.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie,H.T.(Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt.Hon. J.H.M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson,Rt.Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P.Joicey-
Cecil,LordR.(Marylebone,E.)
Clark,GeorgeSmith(Belfast,N.
Cochrane,Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett,A.Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down,North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CurtisCharles(Antrim,S.
Craig,CaptainJames(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison(York)
Faber,Capt.W.V.(Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement(Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway,Rt.Hn.SirJohnH.
Keynon-Slaney,Rt.Hn.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton,Hon.FrederickWm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,RtHn.Lt.-Col.A.B.
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh,W.
Magnus Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore,JohnThrogmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip, A.
Nicholson,Wm.G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker,SirGilbert(Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W.(Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorgeD.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abe,H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W.F.D.(Strand)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.

Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly.

The House divided:—Ayes, 416; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 162.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry

Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter

Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)

Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, James Arthur
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway

Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White,J.D.(Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, JohnHenry(Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarthn
Williams, Osmond(Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxhall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J(CityLond.)
Banbury,Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G(Winchester
Barrie,H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson,Rt.Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil,Lord R.(Marylebone,E.)
Clark,George Smith(Belfast,N.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos.H.A. E.
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cory, Clifford John
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craig,CaptainJames(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,Robert(Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Gordon, J
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(K'nt,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(B'ryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway,Rt.Hon.SirJohnH.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants,Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt Hn. Lt-Col. A. R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long,RtHn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver,SirLewis(EdinburghW
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Middlemore,John Throgmorton
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson,Wm.G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill,Hon.RobertTorrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Walker,Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES —Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Birrell, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

## IRISH COUNCIL BILL.

"To provide for the Establishment and Functions of an Administrative Council in Ireland; and for other purposes connected therewith," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time To-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 182.]

And, it being half-past Eleven of the Clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at half after Eleven o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS.

*Wednesday, 8th May,* 1907.

## PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) [H.L.]; Worthing Gas.

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Pasley Children Legitimisation—Petition for a Bill.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Brecon and Merthyr Tydvil Junction Railway Bill; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners.

Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Taff Vale Railway Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed for Tuesday next.

Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed.

Swansea Harbour Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed; the Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill; South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill; Brockenhurst Gas Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynamman Railway Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed; The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

United Methodist Church Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]; Selsey Water Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Falmouth Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, and passed.

Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill.—Read 3ª, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

## RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

### JUDICIAL STATISTICS, ENGLAND AND WALES, 1905 (PART II.), CIVIL JUDICIAL STATISTICS.

Statistics relating to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the House of Lords, the Supreme Court of Judicature, County Courts, and other Civil Courts, edited by Sir John Macdonell, C.B., LL.D., a Master of the Supreme Court; presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

### JOURNAL COMMITTEE.

Report from, that the One hundred and thirty-eighth Volume of the Journals (6th Edward VII., 1906), with an Index, was ready for delivery; read, and ordered to lie on the Table; and the said Volume ordered to be delivered in the same manner as the preceding Volumes of the Journals have been delivered.

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

## MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACTS AMMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (LORD LOREBURN): My Lords, this Bill, which has already passed through your Lordships House, was first introduced by the late Ministry, and therefore stands well accredited. Its object is to amend the Matrimonial Causes Acts, 1857 and 1866, by extending the powers of the Court in relation to maintenance and alimony, and it gives leave to intervene to persons whose conduct is in question in the Divorce Court, but who are not now able to intervene. I have no doubt these provisions will commend themselves to your Lordships, and I beg to move that the Bill be read a Second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I hope your Lordships will assent to the Motion which has just been moved by my noble and learned friend. The Bill was originally introduced by myself in its present form, and I think no one will doubt the propriety of its provisions; but the drafting of the measure is open to improvement. I make that criticism the more freely because I have been responsible for the Bill in its present form, but I think it is inconvenient not to be able to see on the face of the Bill what it does. I hope that when the Bill gets into Committee my noble and learned friend on the Woolsack will permit its original author to amend the drafting.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: Nothing will give me greater pleasure than to accept any Amendment the noble and learned Earl may move with the object of improving the drafting of the Bill. I agree with him that it is important to introduce into statutes the plainest and simplest language, and that we should as much as possible avoid legislation by reference.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

## PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, this is a Bill in the same category as the last one. It was originally introduced by our predecessors, and it has already passed through your Lordships' House. The sole purpose of the measure is to allow captains of ships at sea to take evidence on board ship for any purpose relating to proceedings in a Prize Court. I beg to move the Second Reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Wednesday, 8th May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the clock.

## PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill, "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Chelmsford and Merthyr Tydvil," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 183.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill, "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Hertford, the Goole Joint Hospital District, and the Oakengates and Dawley Joint Water Board," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 184.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill, "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Bradford (Yorks), Northampton, and Wigan," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 185.]

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill, reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

## *PETITIONS.*

### EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS) BILL.

Petition from Lambeth, for alteration to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Hamilton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Lambeth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Perth, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition against; from Frogmore; Hoxton; Skirbeck; and Small Heath; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Monmouth, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from Coleford, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

### SECONDARY ENDOWED SCHOOLS (SCHEMES).

Petition from Worcester, for inquiry; to lie upon the Table.

### VACCINATION ACTS.

Petition from the Personal Rights Association, for repeal; to lie upon the Table.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### COLLEGE CHARTER ACT, 1871 (COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AT SOUTH KENSINGTON).

Paper [presented 7th May] to be printed. [No. 141.]

### JUDICIAL STATISTICS (ENGLAND AND WALES.)

Copy presented, of Judicial Statistics for England and Wales, 1905. Part II. (Civil Judicial Statistics), edited by Sir John Macdonnell, C.B., LL.D., Master of the Supreme Court [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES.)

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3777 and 3778 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

---

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

### Capital Expediture by Local Education Authorities.

MR. ARMITAGE (Leeds, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Education what is the total capital expenditure of local education authorities, including that spent by school boards, on the provision of public elementary schools from the coming into operation of the Education Act, 1870, down to the end of the last financial year; what amount was owing by local education authorities under this head at the commencement of the last financial year; and what was the amount paid by local education authorities during that year for interest and for sinking funds respectively on such indebtedness.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Complete figures for total capital expenditure on the provision of public elementary schools are not avaliable, but the amount of loans for the provision of public elementary schools sanctioned to school boards since 1870 was £48,764,481 10s. 2d., and to local education authorities under the Education Act, 1902, to 31st March, 1906, £4,437,035, together amounting to £53,201,516 10s. 2d. The loans outstanding on 31st March, 1905, amounted to £35,878,591 12s. 11d. and the payments in respect of loans for the year ending 31st March, 1905, to £2,210,964. The figures for outstanding loans and for payments in respect of loans for the year ended 31st March, 1906, are not yet available.

### Salaries of Irish School Teachers.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he state the number of teachers who entered the service of the National Board since 1st April, 1900, who are in charge of schools with averages under sixty, and are paid a higher salary than £70 per annum (exclusive of residual capitation grant or results for Irish or mathematics); and whether he can state the reasons assigned by the Commissioners for paying these teachers this higher rate of salary.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that there are twelve such teachers as are referred to in the Question. In three cases the salaries include bonuses of £9 each, which the teachers were granted under the Fourth Schedule to the Irish Education Act of 1892 while serving as assistant teachers. In one case the teacher was granted the special salary on account of a previous service of nearly twelve years in England. In three cases the teachers had served as substitute teachers prior to 1st April, 1900, and were allowed credit for this service when their salaries were fixed on permanent appointment. In the remaining cases the strict application of the rules regarding salaries in force in 1901–2 would, in the judgment of the Commissioners, have operated inequitably, and these and similar cases were, under the powers then possessed by the Board, specially considered.

### Scottish Valuation Bill—Date of Introduction.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the Prime Minister if he can state whether the Valuation Bill for Scotland will be introduced before the Witsuntide Recess.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) Yes, it will be introduced next Monday under the ten minutes rule.

### Telegraphists and Clerical Duties.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has issued a general instruction that telegraphists are to be given opportunities to acquire a knowledge of clerical duties that are usually performed by senior telegraphists or overseers; and whether he will direct that at Edinburgh steps should be taken to institute a rotary system in accordance with his expressed desire.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) After giving careful consideration to the question, I have decided that the system of employing sorting clerks and telegraphists in rotation upon the simpler writing duties referred to should be extended so far as existing conditions and arrangements will allow. Steps will be taken in this direction at Edinburgh, as at other offices, but the arrangements which it will be practicable to adopt will vary in different cases.

### Pay of Established Chargemen of Labourers in Portsmouth Dockyard.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state how many established chargemen of labourers there were altogether on the 23rd April in the constructive department of Portsmouth Dockyard, and how many of these were receiving the maximum rate of pay, and the dates when they received such maximum rate; whether he will give similar information with respect to hired chargemen of labourers; and whether there have been any additions or variations since the 23rd April.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) On the 23rd April there were three established chargemen of labourers in the constructive department at Portsmouth, all of whom were receiving the maximum rate of pay. The dates on which they received the maximum rates were 1st March, 1897, 10th July, 1897, and 1st April, 1905, respectively. At the same time there were three hired chargemen of labourers borne in that department, none of whom were in receipt of the maximum rate of pay. No additions or variations have been made since the 23rd April.

### Arterial Drainage Commission—Issue of Appendix to Report.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he say when the Appendix to the Report of the Arterial Drainage Commission will be issued.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Appendix to the Report of this Commission was laid upon the Table on the 2nd instant, and I understand that His Majesty's Stationery Office will be in a position to circulate copies in the course of next week.

### Foreign Legislation on Gambling in in Options and Futures.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Texas Legislature has recently passed an anti-option Bill which absolutely prohibits trading in cotton futures; and that Tennessee, Mississippi, and Louisiana are the only States in which such legislation has not been passed; and whether, under the circumstances, he will take steps to obtain full information on this recent legislation in the United States of America from His Majesty's representatives abroad, and issue the same for the benefit of both Houses as a Supplementary Parliamentary Paper to the one just issued on the Reports of the Canadian Government and His Majesty's representatives abroad on legislative measures respecting gambling in option and future contracts as regards foodstuffs.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) I will endeavour to obtain information with regard to recent legislation on this subject in each of the United States and to issue it in the form of a Return.

### Vaccination Bill—Compensation to Vaccination Officers.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): To ask the President of the Local Government Board what provision he proposes to make for the compensation of the vaccination officers, who will lose the greater part of their fees if his Bill passes into law.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I do not propose to make provision on this subject in the Bill.

### The National Physical Laboratory Inquiry Committee.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that distrust of the Committee now inquiring into the management of the National Physical Laboratory, on the ground that two of its members are also members of the executive of the laboratory, has been expressed and has received no public contradiction; and will he give effect to the same and allay the anxiety created by the competition of an institution receiving a Government subsidy with private and professional interests in making commercial tests.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have already informed the honourable Member, in reply to two previous Questions, that I see no grounds for the distrust to which he refers; and I have also expressed the opinion that the composition of the Committee should command the confidence of all impartially-minded persons. To these replies I have nothing to add.

### Payment of Income-tax by Co-operative Trading Societies.

MR. FIELD: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether he is aware of the partial or total freedom from assessment to income-tax of limited liability, joint stock, Civil Service, Army and Navy, and co-operative societies; whether he will adopt the scheme as submitted by the Central Agency, Traders Defence Associations, for the assessment of Income Tax of these bodies, seeing that the Income Tax Committee admitted that, if put into operation, it would bring in about two millions sterling annually to the Treasury; and whether, in the event of his not adopting the scheme, he will appoint a Committee of the House of Commons to inquire fully into this matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) Societies like the Civil Service and the Army and Navy Stores, and other limited liability and joint stock co-operative societies (so-called), are directly assessed to income-tax on their profits just like other trading companies. The exemption from direct assessment is confined to industrial co-operative societies registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act. This was very fully considered by the late Lord Ritchie's Committee in 1905 (see paragraphs 130–140 of their Report [Cd. 2575]), and they came to the conclusion that no case was made out for altering the law. I see no reason for any further inquiry. The scheme of the Central Agency of the Traders Defence Associations was for the imposition of a special tax, assessed on a different basis from the income-tax, upon these associations. I am not aware that this drastic suggestion has received support from anyone except from its own authors.

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Obsolete War Ships.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what were the original prices of the two war vessels last sold from the Holy Loch, when were they built, and what prices they have now brought; whether he will consider whether better figures could be obtained if no condition was attached insisting on the breaking up of the vessels; and if he will take steps to alter this condition.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The ships to which my hon. friend refers are the "Conqueror" and "Undaunted." The "Conqueror" was completed in 1886 at a cost of £401,991, and fetched £16,800. The "Undaunted" was completed in 1889 at a cost of £273,737, and fetched £14,400. The question of the conditions of sale, which is not merely a question of finance, is under consideration.

### Army Stores for South Africa.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn); I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the value and description of the principal items of supplies and stores sent to South Africa in 1906 for the use or consumption of the military forces stationed there; and how much of these were purchased in the United Kingdom and foreign countries respectively.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): The following figures show the value of the principal supplies sent to South Africa for the year ending 31st March, 1906:—Purchased in the United Kingdom—provisions, £19,281; disinfectants, £157; fuel and light, £2,260; forage, £10,846. In addition to the above, £2,288 and £4,345 were expended in British Colonies and foreign countries respectively for preserved meat. As regards warlike stores sent to South Africa as distinguished from supplies, the value could perhaps be ascertained, but it would be impossible to trace their origin.

MR. REMNANT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the value of the principal items of stores and supplies purchased in 1906 in South Africa for the use or consumption of the military forces stationed there; and how much of these stores or supplies were obtained in South Africa or were imported.

MR. HALDANE: These figures could only be obtained by a reference to South Africa. Their collection would, I am afraid, entail much labour.

### Army Billets.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of the War Office that innkeepers should be required to provide billets for more men and horses than their premises can accommodate, being thereby compelled to procure accommodation on other premises at a financial loss to themselves; and whether he will issue instructions that in future no person shall be required to provide greater accommodation than his premises afford.

MR. HALDANE: The allocation of the numbers of horses and men to billets does not rest with the military authorities, but with the local police authorities.

### Conversion of Rifles.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War by what date it is expected that the conversion of the

44,000 rifles for which a sum has been taken in the Estimates for 1907–8 will be completed.

MR. HALDANE: It is hoped to complete the conversion of these rifles by the end of the financial year.

### Disturbances in Eastern Bengal.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can make any statement to the House regarding disturbances reported in the Mymensingh district, and in other parts of Eastern Bengal; and whether he can give an assurance that the local authorities are co-operating with the leaders of both communities in restoring those friendly feelings between Hindus and Mahomedans which prevailed in that province before the recent partition of Bengal.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): I have received no official reports of the alleged disturbances; but the hon. Member's own experience as a servant of the Crown will bear me out when I express my belief that it is the desire of every member of the Indian services that all classes of His Majesty's subjects shall live at peace with one another.

Later,

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information about recent occurrences in India which have been the cause of some anxiety in the House, and on which, I am sure, information is anxiously desired.

MR. MORLEY: I think the right hon. Gentleman is quite within his rights in asking a question of this kind, and I have no doubt the country is anxious. I received last night a telegram from the Viceroy. I cannot report it all to the House, for a pretty obvious reason, but I may mention this. In view of the existing situation in the Punjab, Sir Denzil Ibbetson, whom I have already described as one of the ablest and most experienced administrators, now Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, made a formal official application to the Government of India for the arrest and deportation of two of the most prominent agitators, under Regulation III of 1818. The Government of India were unanimously of opinion that immediate action was necessary, and the warrants were accordingly issued yesterday. I may explain that deportation does not mean in this case deportation from India, but from one province to another.

SIR H. COTTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the names of the two persons against whom warrants have been issued?

MR. MORLEY: I must decline at the present stage to state the names, but they will in due course by made known.

### Sir J. L. Mackay's Speech on India and Preferential Tariffs.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the views enunciated by Sir J. L. Makay on behalf of India at the Colonial Conference, on the question of preferential tariff, were given on the authority of the Indian Council of State, or the Viceroy, or the Secretary of State for India; and, if not, on whose authority, by resolution or otherwise, were the statements made.

MR. MORLEY: Sir James Mackay was deputed by me, as Minister responsible for India, to take my place at the Conference. He is a Member of the Council of India, with peculiarly extensive knowledge of all the facts of Indian trade and commerce, and I assumed that this knowledge would be of value as a contribution to the discussions of the Conference. Of course I was acquainted with his opinions on the controversy as to preference. He made his statements on his own authority, but his statements of fact do not seem to have been shaken, and in his inferences from them both I and other members of His Majesty's Government who were present entirely concur.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked if Sir James Mackay had consulted in any way the chambers of commerce of Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, and the other great centres of India, or firms in this country trading with India.

MR. MORLEY: What consultations Sir James Mackay had I do not know, but I may state that he was himself for many years resident in and connected with trade in India, and knows thoroughly well what are the views of the trading community in India.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Was he engaged in trade in India?

MR. MORLEY: Certainly—so I understand.

SIR H. COTTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Sir James Mackay was for several years president of the chamber of commerce of Calcutta?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman can supplement that information by saying whether Sir James Mackay represents the opinions of the chamber of commerce of Calcutta at the present time.

MR. MORLEY: I must have notice of that, but I do not know that it comes within my Department to find out the opinions of the Calcutta Chamber of Commerce.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the free trade policy pursued in India is destroying the native industry?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Imperial Conference Reports.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if Lord Elgin is aware that dissatisfaction prevails among the colonial statesmen attending the Imperial Conference concerning the abridgements of their speeches issued by the Colonial Office to the Press; and if, having regard to the importance of no misunderstanding arising hereafter concerning their utterances or the statements of members of the Government of the United Kingdom and the statistics produced, he will undertake that a verbatim report of the whole proceedings shall be laid before Parliament by 1st July.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): No, Sir. The Secretary of State is not aware of the existence of the dissatisfaction referred to by the hon. and gallant Member. As has been repeatedly pointed out, it is for the Conference itself to decide the question of the publication of its proceedings, and no decision has yet been taken. If it is decided to publish, the Papers will be laid as soon as is found practicable, but no definite date can be given.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT asked whether a verbatim report of the proceedings in the Conference had been taken by a person experienced in taking verbatim reports and whether, if the members of the Conference so desired, the proceedings could be published *in extenso.*

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir. The most full and careful and, I think, excellent record has been kept of every word spoken at the Conference, and is now being corrected by the members who took part in the discussion. I have every reason to believe that publication will be made of the discussion.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: In full?

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether any representations have been made by any of those taking part in the proceedings of the Imperial Conference respecting the inadequacy or inaccuracy of the official reports of those proceedings issued to the Press; and whether he will submit to the Conference the desirability of their sanctioning the issue of a verbatim report of the proceedings as early as possible.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I am not aware that any such representations have been made and, as I have repeatedly explained, all steps with regard to a report of the proceedings are entirely for the discretion of the Conference.

MR. PIKE PEASE: May I ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that one of the most important speeches made at the Imperial Conference was incorrectly summarised, and that no statement to that effect was sent to the Press for several days?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have just said I have no control over the matter.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will state who is the official responsible for preparing the published *précis* of the proceedings of the Colonial Conference; and whether the *précis* are in all cases submitted for the approval of the members of the Conference before being issued to the Press.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The *précis* are prepared by the officials of the Colonial Office who are acting as Secretaries to the Conference. I am informed that it has not been found practicable in most cases, for want of time, to obtain the approval of members of the Conference to the *précis* of their speeches.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to the official report of his address to the Imperial Conference, how the figures relating to the incidence of the Canadian tariff on United Kingdom and United States produce, respectively, were obtained; and whether the method employed is the same as that adopted by the Board of Trade for the calculations published in the Memorandum X. of the Second Fiscal Blue-book.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): The figures which I used represent in each case the percentage proportion of duty actually collected to value of all goods imported into Canada from the two countries respectively. The method adopted by the Board of Trade in the Memorandum referred to was a different one, and was selected (as is there explained) for a particular purpose—viz., the comparison of the incidence of the tariffs of different countries upon the principal articles of British export trade, having regard to the relative importance of those articles to that trade as a whole.

MR. ARKWRIGHT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer with reference to the official Report of his address to the Imperial Conference, if he can state what was the value of United Kingdom goods imported into the Australian Commonwealth in 1906; and what would be the approximate value of these goods affected by the proposed scheme of Australian preference

MR. ASQUITH: The figures for 1906 are not as yet available.

### The Imperial Conference and Irish Home Rule.

MR. WALKER (Leicestershire, Melton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Deakin, who have, in their own Parliaments, supported, by speech as well as by vote, the principle of Home Rule for Ireland, have expressed a desire to raise the question at the present Imperial Conference; and, if not, whether His Majesty's Government will invite a discussion on the subject, as being a matter of importance to the whole of the Empire.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am informed that Sir Wilfred Laurier and Mr. Deakin have not expressed a desire to raise the question of Home Rule for Ireland at the Conference; and it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to invite the Conference to discuss this subject, but we have no desire to slam the door.

### Sir Alexander Swettenham.

MR. HADDOCK (Lancashire, North Lonsdale): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether an offer was made to Sir Alexander Swettenham to withdraw Lord Elgin's message of censure if Sir Alexander Swettenham would withdraw his resignation of the Governorship of Jamaica.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir.

MR. HADDOCK: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Secretary of State for War submitted his telegram, relating to the action of Sir Alexander Swettenham, to the Foreign Office before transmitting it to the United States Government.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir E. GREY): The Secretary of State for War consulted both the

Foreign Office and the Colonial Office in any action he took in this matter.

### Cotton Growing in British East Africa.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government, in order to encourage the cultivation of cotton in British East Africa, has granted a subsidy and given special facilities to any company which is also engaged in other trades and industries than the cultivation of cotton; and whether the Government will in future make it a condition of any similar grant to any person or company that such person or company is engaged in no trade or industry other than that in respect of which the grant is made.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Government has agreed to pay £1,000 a year for three years from the funds of the East Africa Protectorate towards the cost of the experimental work in connection with cotton growing to be undertaken by the British Cotton Growing Association provided that the association spend at least an equal amount from their own funds upon experimental work—making not less than £2,000 a year in all. The association are co-operating in the matter of growing cotton with a company called the British East Africa Corporation Limited, but no subsidy or special facilities have been or will be granted by the Government to the company, and payment of the contribution to the association will only be made upon proof that at least twice the amount of the contribution has been *bona fide* expended upon experimental work.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) asked whether, before any subsidies were granted, a railway in Northern Nigeria would be considered by His Majesty's Government.

MR. CHURCHILL: We are considering the question of a railway in Northern Nigeria, but we are also facilitating the work of the British Cotton-Growing Association in developing the sources of the cotton supply in different parts.

MR. MARKHAM asked whether it was not the fact that cotton was not indigenous in any part except Northern Nigeria.

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to say that the cotton in East Africa and Uganda was very good.

### Trade with the Volta District.

MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what has been the amount of our trade with the Volta district during each of the past four half-years; what is the charge annually levied as canoe tax on the Volta, and whether it is levied on all using the river; what is the tax levied upon salt there; and whether he has received Reports that these taxes have resulted in British trade being diverted to the German traders in Togoland.

MR. CHURCHILL: Separate statistics of the trade with the Volta district are not available. An annual licence is payable for all canoes at the rate of 1s. for canoes not exceeding 25 feet in length, the rate for larger canoes being proportionately higher. The tax on salt referred to is really a ferry toll, varying from 1s. to 5s. a load according to the distance of the ferry from the mouth of the river. Reports received from the Governor do not support the view that the effect of the tolls is to divert British trade; he is of opinion that their abolition would have that effect.

### St. Lucia Riots.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give further information as to the state of affairs in St. Lucia and the nature and extent of the riots.

MR. CHURCHILL: The following telegram was received from the Governor on the 2nd May: "2nd May, 'Indefatigable' arrived 1st May. Detachment of Royal Marines relieve Barbados police Dennery for a short time. Roseau, Culdesac, Vieuxfort factories at work, Dennery partly working. Coalheavers on learning that trade leaving port relinquished recent rise wages continuing work at former rates subject to minor increases. Barbados police returning, position highly satisfactory." In a further telegram dated 5th May, the Governor reported that he was sailing for Grenada on that day. It may, therefore, be assumed that the disturbances are at an end.

### Warships in West Indian Waters.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of recent events, any request has been put forward by the Colonial Office to the Admiralty for the provision of more vessels for service in West Indian waters.

MR. CHURCHILL: In view of recent events the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty have decided to detail a cruiser in addition to H.M.S. "Indefatigable" for temporary service in West Indian waters. The general question has been receiving, and will continue to receive, the careful attention of His Majesty's Government.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Can the right hon. Gentleman state what the cruiser is likely to be?

MR. CHURCHILL: I think the cruiser is called the "Scylla," a sister ship of the "Indefatigable."

### New Hebrides—Female Labour.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any Return of the numbers of women and girls under age who are to be employed under the New Hebrides Convention will be issued.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is impossible to give any estimate of the number of females, if any, who will be employed under the labour clauses of the New Hebrides Convention, and I may add that it would be impossible in many cases to ascertain whether or not they are under the age of twenty-one. It is to be presumed, however, that the number of females employed will at least be considerably smaller when the Convention comes into operation than at present. There are now, and have hitherto been, no restrictions whatever on the employment of women and children by British subjects in the New Hebrides.

### Jamaica Earthquake—Government Grant.

MR. O. C. PHILIPPS (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is now possible to announce the decision of His Majesty's Government with regard to the question of Imperial assistance to the island of Jamaica.

MR. CHURCHILL: His Majesty's Government have decided, in answer to the representations which have been made on behalf of Jamaica, to make a free grant of £150,000 in aid of the sufferers from the earthquake in that island, and also to make a loan of £800,000 to the Colonial Government mainly for rebuilding purposes. A supplementary Estimate providing for the sum of £150,000 will be laid before the House as soon as possible, and when the terms of the loan have been finally settled, they will be embodied in a Bill.

### Labour on the Rand.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if his attention had been called to the strike of white miners in the Rand gold mines and if he had any information to give the House with regard to this serious dispute; were the disturbances due to an attempt on the part of the mineowners to engage Chinese labour on work formerly done by white workmen, contrary to the stipulations of the Chinese Labour Ordinance; and what action was it proposed to take in the matter.

MR. CHURCHILL said he had no information with regard to the reported strike other than that contained in the newspapers, but he had every confidence that the local Government of the Transvaal would be fully able to deal with any situation that might arise there.

### Income-Tax Refunds.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, how much income-tax was refunded under the provisions of Section 133 of the Income-tax Act, 1842, in respect of income-tax overpaid in each of the last three years, viz., in 1904, 1905, and 1906.

MR. ASQUITH: The figures cannot be given with exact precision. But approximately the following were the amounts of tax repaid under the provisions of Section 133 of the Act of 1842 (as amended) in the years named:—1903–4, £340,000; 1904–5, £430,000; 1905–6, £500,000.

### Naturalisation Fees.

MR. STUART SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state whether persons naturalised in the British Colonies have the same *status* in the United Kingdom as in the Colonies; and whether he will take advantage of the presence of the Colonial Premiers in this country to promote an agreement to secure a moderate and uniform fee for the privilege of becoming a British citizen throughout the Empire.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I beg to answer on behalf of my right hon. friend. The whole of the important question of naturalisation throughout the Empire is being considered by the Colonial Conference. Beyond this I can make no statement, except to say that under the existing law naturalisation conferred in a Colony does not extend to this country or to other Colonies.

### Crimes by Aliens.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hants, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is able to state how many crimes were committed by aliens in London during 1906.

MR. GLADSTONE: It is impossible to say how many crimes have been committed by aliens, in London or elsewhere; but the hon. Member will find in the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member for West Down, on March 26th,† a statement covering the last five years for which figures are available of the number of persons received into London prisons on conviction, summary or other, who, according to their own statements, were born in foreign countries.

### Crime in Lincolnshire.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can say, approximately, how many of the 1,218 crimes and 14,200 offences in Lincolnshire in 1905 were committed in the Brigg Division of that county; how many appear under each of the headings of serious crime; and if he will say how he proposes to deal with the condition of the Brigg Division.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have no figures in my possession showing the number of crimes and offences committed in the Brigg Division apart from the rest of the county, and I have no reason to suppose that any action is required on my part with regard to the matter.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD: Is there any agrarian crime in this division?

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): And have there been any cases of juries refusing to convict in the face of the evidence?

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Have Brigg juries ever been packed?

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Have both crime and the population in the division increased since the last election?

MR. GLADSTONE: This is all very interesting, but I am afraid I cannot go into these Questions.

### Police Promotion Regulations in Cumberland.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he is aware that the Cumberland Standing Joint Committee has instructed the chief constable only to promote such police officers as will consent to postpone their right of retirement upon pension beyond the period mutually contracted for at the time of their joining the force, in pursuance of the Police Superannuation Act, 1890; and whether, seeing that this course is contrary to the statutory rights of the police officers affected, he will communicate with the authorities concerned.

MR. GLADSTONE: The same course as that taken by the Cumberland Standing Joint Committee has been taken from time to time by other police authorities from 1892 onwards. I am advised that it is in conformity with the terms of the statute.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 1648.

### Stepney Parliamentary Register.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the proportion of foreign-born voters to British-born in the various wards of the Stepney Parliamentary area.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have no official information as to the birthplace of voters, nor is there any means that I am aware of for obtaining such information.

### Case of Frederick Thomas Hemsley.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether a decision has yet been reached with reference to the case of Frederick Thomas Hemsley, who was sentenced on 10th April to five years detention at Redhill reformatory school.

MR. GLADSTONE; I have carefully considered this case, and while I am convinced that the only object the magistrates had in view in taking the course they did was to benefit the boy, I have decided, in all the circumstances, that Hemsley may be discharged.

### Compulsory Weighing in the Iron and Steel Trades.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether in the inquiry into the need for compulsory weighing and measuring in connection with the iron and steel trades he will appoint a representative from Scotland to the Committee, in view of the fact that these trades in that country employ a large number of workmen.

MR. GLADSTONE: I will consider my hon. friend's suggestion; but I prefer to retain the Committee as it is, unless I find that the conditions under which these industries are carried on in Scotland are so different from those obtaining in England as to make separate representation indispensable.

### Wages in the English Cotton Trade.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state the amount paid in the English cotton trade per week in wages per 10,000 spindles and per 100 looms respectively.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): I regret that the information for which the hon. Member asks is not available.

MR. LONSDALE: Will the Board of Trade make the inquiries?

### Value of Imports for the Colonies.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will state the amount in millions sterling of the imports into this country from the Colonies for the year 1905.

MR. KEARLEY: The total values as shown in the United Kingdom Trade Accounts were as follows:—From self-governing Colonies, £72,000,000; from British India, £36,000,000; from all British possessions, including the self-governing Colonies and India, £127,750,000. These values are "c.i.f." at port of arrival.

### Exports to British Garrisons Abroad.

MR. REMNANT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any record is kept of the exports of stores and supplies for British garrisons stationed abroad; and whether he can state the value of the principal items exported to South Africa for the use or consumption of the military and naval forces stationed in that country.

MR. KEARLEY: No account is taken in the official trade statistics of goods shipped by His Majesty's Government for the use of His Majesty's Forces abroad.

MR. REMNANT: Will the Board in future keep distinct records of all goods supplied to the different stations abroad?

### London Local Taxation Returns.

MR. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what is the reason why the Local Taxation Returns of the expenditure of the local authorities in London for the year 1904–5 are not yet published; whether the delay in publication is greater than it has been in former years; and whether he can make arrangements whereby the audited accounts of these authorities may be in the possession of the public within twelve months after the close of their financial year.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): There has been some delay, due to various causes, in the issue of certain parts of the Local Taxation Returns for the year 1904–5. The part which includes abstracts of the accounts of the several metropolitan authorities is, however, in an advanced state of preparation, and will shortly be issued. I am afraid that it is not practicable to issue these Returns within twelve months after the end of the financial year to which they relate.

### London Electoral Lists.

MR. DICKINSON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the council of a metropolitan borough has intimated to the town clerk that he is not to expend the same amount of money in preparing the list of electors as that which he expended at the last revision, and which was approved as proper and reasonable by the revising barrister; whether, as under the London Government Act, 1899, the town clerk is specially charged with the powers, duties, and liabilities of the overseers with respect to the preparation of lists of voters, the borough council has any power to restrict him in the execution of this duty; and whether, as there is a statutory obligation upon the town clerk to inquire and ascertain with respect to every dwelling-house whether any person is entitled to be registered as a voter, the Board can take any steps to ensure that the proper measures are adopted to make the lists of electors as complete and accurate as possible.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have no information as to the case referred to in the first part of the Question, but I may say generally that I am not aware that a borough council would be empowered to restrict the town clerk in the execution of the duty devolving upon him under the London Government Act in relation to the preparation of lists of voters. I have, however, no control over either the borough council or the town clerk in the matter.

### Glasgow Telephone Employees.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he proposes to extend to the telephone employees, lately transferred from the Glasgow Corporation, the terms of transfer promised by the late Postmaster-General to the employees of the National Telephone Company to be transferred to the Post Office in 1911, and if the terms to be accorded will be retrospective; whether he has been asked to receive a deputation from the two unions representing the Glasgow employees; and, if so, when he proposes to see such a deputation

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I am now engaged in settling the establishment of the telephone operators lately transferred from the Glasgow Corporation. The conditions will be largely the same as those arranged for the transfer of the National Telephone Company's staff in 1912, but the circumstances are not identical, and certain of the conditions in the latter case will not be applicable in the Glasgow case. There does not seem to be any advantage in receiving a deputation at the present time.

### Religious Tests in Training Colleges.

MR. HENRY (Shropshire, Wellington): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board of Education will refrain from giving grants to those training colleges for elementary school teachers which impose the condition that candidates who desire to enter these colleges should be compelled to submit to confirmation and to the creeds and catechisms of any particular church inconsistent with the religious belief and conviction of the candidate.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouth, N.): Pending the issue of the Training College Regulations, which I hope will take place very shortly, I regret I cannot make any statement as to the conditions of the admission of students which will in future be imposed.

### Supreme Court of Judicature Clerks.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the number of clerks in the Central Office of the Supreme Court of Judicature who have served for forty years and upwards, and their respective ages.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The particulars for which the hon. Member asks are given me as follows:—Total number 11.

Ages—Years.

64, 59, 64, 60, 60, 65, 60, 59, 70, 61, 59.

Length of Service—Years.

43, 42, 43, 45, 43, 48, 43, 42, 41, 41, 41.

### Foreign Trawlers in the Moray Firth.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland how many foreign trawlers other than Norwegian have been reported fishing in the Moray Firth in the course of the last six months; whether any of these have been examined by the Scottish authorities; and whether any English fishermen have been reported on board.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): During the past six months five foreign trawlers other than Norwegian have been observed. On four Belgian vessels no Englishmen were reported to be on board. On one Swedish vessel the whole crew except flagmaster were English.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: Will these Englishmen also be prosecuted?

MR. SINCLAIR: No doubt.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY (Grimsby): On what authority are these foreign vessels boarded by British officers?

MR. SINCLAIR: I cannot say; I only know what the Fishery Board have reported to me.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY: How can information be obtained unless the boats are boarded?

MR. SINCLAIR: I will leave it to my hon. friend to say.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY: Is there any understanding between the two Governments?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Irish Land Court Receivers.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that ability to make the most of property for the benefit of owners and money lenders is the sole qualification required in the appointment of receivers over estates for sale in the Land Judge's Court; that prices to be advanced by the State are now commonly fixed on the recommendations of these men, without any independent inquiry on behalf of either purchasers or State; and, if so, can he see his way to imposing competent inspection in all cases of sale.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Question is based on a misapprehension of the facts. In the case of estates for sale in the Land Judge's Court an inspection of the tenant's holding is made by the Land Commission in every case in which the tenant applies for an advance for the purchase of his holding. The Land Commission have full power to make or refuse the advance applied for, or to sanction an advance of less amount. The Land Judge informs me that it is not the case that the prices to be advanced are fixed on the recommendations of the receivers, and he entirely repudiates the suggestion contained in the first part of the Question.

MR. FLAVIN: Where a tenant buys within the zones and has no stock on the land, what means have the Estates Commissioners of ascertaining what security there is for the advance?

MR. BIRRELL: I must ask for notice of that Question.

### Burrowes Estate Agreements.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the case of the Burrowes Estate, in which, because the tenants have signed so-called voluntary agreements, the Land Judge desires public money to be advanced to the money lenders, and those tenants to be made liable to repay, with interest, the full value of the owners' property, with the full value of the tenants' property and improvements added, and £350 in excess of this gross sum for which there is no security; will that advance be peremptorily prevented; and, seeing that this is common practice where the zones prevent its detection, does he propose to empower the Irish Council to deal with it.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed by the Land Judge that in this case the tenants voluntarily entered into an agreement for the purchase of their holdings at prices which would give them a reduction of 7s. in the pound on first term rents and 4s. 6d. on second term rents. The Estates Commissioners made an offer under Section 7 of the Act of 1903 for the purchase of the estate with the object of reselling it to the tenants. The price offered by the Commissioners was less than that which the tenants had agreed to pay, but the Commissioners declined to increase their offer, and as the incumbrancers were prepared to accept the lesser sum, the Land Judge approved of the sale.

### Irish Land Purchase Arrears.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of cases in which proceedings involving cost have been initiated by or on behalf of the Irish Land Commission for recovery of arrears of instalments and of rents respectively in operations under the Land Act of 1903, from the 1st November 1903 to the 31st March 1907.

MR. BIRRELL: The Land Commission inform me that the preparation of Returns giving the precise information asked for in the Question would occupy much time, and would necessarily interfere with the work of collecting annuities. It will probably be sufficient for the hon. Member's purpose to state that on 1st December 1906, there were 32,449 payers of annuities under the Act of 1903. In March 1907 the Commissioners found it necessary to direct proceedings against 469 of these persons for the recovery of arrears. Two hundred and forty-nine of these have since paid, and the proceedings against the remaining 220 are in various stages. If the hon. Member will refer to the Annual Reports of the Land Commission, he will find in the Appendices full particulars of every annuity in arrear for one year and upwards.

### Irish Tenant Rights

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if any calculation or estimate has been made of the value of the tenant-right or occupation interest and improvements in tenanted land throughout Ireland which Section 1 of the Act of 1881 empowers tenants to sell for the best price that can be got for the same; and, if not, in view of the confiscation of this property by way of sale to its owners, and a general repudiation of the liability, does he contemplate any scheme for ascertaining the value of this property and securing it to its owners.

MR. BIRRELL: When a fair rent is fixed by the Land Commission the particulars of all sales of the tenancy which have taken place since 1870 are set out in the Schedule recorded by the Court, as well as the capital value of all improvements allowed to the tenant. In the opinion of the Land Commission no other calculation or estimate could be made. The right of the tenant to sell his tenancy under Section 1 of the Act of 1881 is subject to the landlord's right of pre-emption. When the landlord exercises that right and the parties disagree as to the price, the true value of the tenancy is fixed by the Court. According to the definition adopted by the Court of Appeal, the true value of the tenancy is that which would be given for the holding by a thoroughly solvent and prudent man who intended to make the rent out of it and a fair profit on his capital.

### Dingle Harbour.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutentant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Dingle Harbour Board have applied for a grant for the extension of the pier and the dredging of the habour; that they spent all their available funds in dredging last year and left the work very incomplete; and that the fishing industry, which is one of the most important in the West of Ireland, is very seriously injured owing to insufficient dredging; and whether, seeing that if something is not done soon a number of fishermen will be thrown out of employment, he will ask to have the Department's dredger sent down for a few months.

MR. BIRRELL: I beg to refer to my Answer to the hon. Member's previous Question of 18th April.† I am informed that the engagements for the present season already made for the dredger belonging to the Department of Agriculture render it almost certain that the vessel will not be free to do any work at Dingle this year.

### Annagh Bogs, Buttevant.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been called to the circumstances connected with Annagh bogs, Churchtown, Buttevant, county Cork; are they aware that, on the sale of the Egmont Estate in 1889, the tenants on the property were assured that these lands were to be sold to them at reasonable terms, notwithstanding which promise, Captain Trench, agent to the estate, was recognised as tenant by the landlord, and subsequently purchased them at a reduced figure, with the result that he now holds these lands for which the tenants formerly paid £174 yearly at an annual rent of £16; and whether, in view of the promises held out to the former tenants, and the fact that the State money was advanced to this gentleman to enable him to carry out the purchase, the Commissioners will communicate with Captain Trench with a view to inducing him to sell these lands to the former holders on reasonable terms.

MR. BIRRELL: The Land Commission inform me that the holding referred to in the Question was purchased in 1901 by Captain Trench as tenant in occupation. The purchase price was £400, of which the purchaser paid £100 in cash and £300 was advanced under the Land Purchase Acts. The latter amount has since been redeemed. The Land Commission have no information that any such promise as is averred in the Question was made to the tenants of the estates.

MR. FLYNN: Will the Land Commissioners further inquire into the matter?

MR. BIRRELL: The purchase has been completed and the annuity redeemed. Captain Trench is now the owner.

### Lord Inchiquin and his Tenants.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Lord Inchiquin has caused his solicitor to threaten the tenants on his estate with writs for the payment of rents, as the tenants would not agree to pay the purchase price demanded for the estate; whether the Estates Commissioners will negotiate with the landlord for a purchase, seeing that the tenants at a public meeting at Newmarket-on-Fergus, presided over by the Rev. M. Hogan, Adm., have declared that they are ready to buy at fair prices; or whether he proposes to take any steps to prevent the unrest that will arise if Lord Inchiquin is allowed to press for the payment of excessive rents.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have no information as to the matter of fact alleged in the Question. No proceedings for the sale of the estate referred to have been instituted before the Commissioners, and they have received no request that they should intervene as conciliators under the Lord-Lieutenant's Regulations. If any such application should be made to them, they will give it due consideration.

MR. HALPIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that some of the tenants offered eighteen and a-half years purchase and some twenty and a-half?

MR. BIRRELL: I have no information as to that.

### Roscomroe Grazing Farm Dispute.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Luttrell, who for many years has held a grazing farm on a yearly tenancy in the townland of Roscomroe, in the Roscrea Union, has been required by the United Irish League to surrender his tenancy, and has refused; whether he is aware that, on the night of 29th April, Mr. Luttrell's cattle, sheep, and horses were driven off the lands and taken into the town of Roscrea; whether this act was known to be in contemplation, and whether the police made any preparations to prevent it; and what arrangements are being made to prevent a repetition of this act.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1129-30.

MR. BIRRELL: Mr. Luttrell has informed the police authorities that he received a letter from the local branch of the United Irish League asking him whether he would surrender his grazing farm, and that he refused to do so. The cattle were driven off the farm and left uninjured outside Mr. Luttrell's house in Roscrea early on the morning of the 29th April. It had been threatened that the cattle would be driven off, but owing to the remoteness of the place and to the fact that the date was kept secret, the police were unable to take full measures to prevent the act. The police are doing all that may be possible to prevent a repetition of the occurrence.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this is not a yearly tenancy?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. REDDY: It's an eleven months farm.

### Irish Intermediate Education.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the proposed modifications of the intermediate education system in Ireland, embodied in the new programme for 1908, the Board proposes to make two languages, besides English, compulsory; that, by the existing regulations prior to the adoption by this House of the Motion of the hon. Member for West Kerry, only one language, with English, was obligatory, and that this Motion merely put Irish on the same footing as other languages, and, accordingly, that the new Rules are an evasion of the Resolution of the House of Commons on the subject of Irish; is he aware that the English Board of Education pay grants to secondary schools in which no modern language is taught, and in which the needs of the locality are their first consideration, and that the London University course can be passed with only one foreign language; and whether, in view of all the circumstances of the case, the Lord-Lieutenant will order the Intermediate Board to withdraw the rule making two languages, with English, obligatory.

MR. BIRRELL: The Rules for 1908, having lain upon the Table for the specified time without disallowment, are now in force and cannot be altered. I find that my predecessor fully considered the question now raised by the hon. Member, and I do not therefore propose to enter into it afresh. I would refer to Mr. Bryce's Answer to the Question of the hon. Member for West Leitrim on 19th December last.†

MR. FLYNN asked if the Motion passed by that House on the subject last May had not been ignored.

MR. BIRRELL said the reasons for the action were stated in the Answer he had referred to.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Is it not the fact that the Motion only applied to the Rules for 1907, and that hon. Members made no objection to the Rules for 1908 which are now in force?

MR. BIRRELL: That is so.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in respect to the Intermediate Education Programme and Rules for 1908, whether the attention of the Lord-Lieutenant was called to that part of the syllabus dealing with arithmetic and algebra; is he aware that on the pass papers arithmetic counts for 30 per cent. only of the entire, whilst algebra counts for 70 per cent., and in the honour papers arithmetic counts for 10 per cent. only and algebra for 90; is he aware that in the examinations for the Second Division Civil Service arithmetic counts for 600 marks and elementary mathematics for 400; and whether the Commissioners will be invited to modify the rule, which acts so disadvantageously on pupils who may be intended for an industrial or commercial career, or for the Civil Service.

MR. BIRRELL: The relative percentages of the value of arithmetic and algebra under the Rules of the Intermediate Education Board are correctly stated in the Question. The object of the Board is to test whether students of Intermediate Schools have acquired a general education, and accordingly they do not require the specialisation in arithmetic which may be necessary in the second division of the Civil Service.

---

† See (4) *Debates* clxvii, 1522—23.

MR. FLYNN : Is it not the fact that the rule penalises the vast majority who are going in for industrial or commercial and other pursuits suitable to Ireland ?

MR. BIRRELL : There is something in what the hon. Member suggests.

MR. FLYNN : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the Intermediate Education Programme for 1908, whether the attention of the Lord-Lieutenant was called to Rule 4 before the official sanction was given to the rules ; is he aware that in order to pass in experimental science pupils must work through the prescribed course to the satisfaction of an inspector of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, and to pass with honours must pass a qualifying practical test by the inspector, and failure to satisfy the inspector in a single practical question involves total disqualification from winning a scholarship or exhibition, no matter how successful the student may be in all other respects ; if he can say under what statute, or other enabling power, the Intermediate Commissioners delegated their powers to the officials of another distinct Department ; are the Commissioners aware that these inspectors are nominated by the Board of Agriculture independent of examination, and that many of them have no University degree whatever ; and whether, in view of the opposition to this rule on the part of many head masters, it will be withdrawn or modified by His Excellency.

MR. BIRRELL : The hon. Member refers to Regulation 9 (b) (4) of the Programme of the Intermediate Education Board. The arrangement referred to in the Question has been in force since 1902, and the Board hold that they have full statutory power to make such arrangement. The facts are not precisely as stated in the Question, and I am forwarding to the hon. Member a full report on the subject which I have received. As I have already stated the Rules for 1908 are now in force, and cannot be altered.

MR. FLYNN : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in connection with the Irish Intermediate Education system, whether he is aware that in the years preceding 1906 the programme of future examination was published by the Board once it was laid upon the Table of this House, thus giving head masters' associations and others interested an opportunity of considering it, but that in regard to the new programme for 1908, laid upon the Table late in the autumn session, 1906, no outsider saw a copy of it until the forty days had expired, and that few Members of this House were aware of its provision ; and whether, in view of the opposition to the proposed changes contemplated in the new programme, almost unanimously expressed by head masters and head mistresses' associations, he will represent to the Board the necessity for modifying the programme in such a manner as will make it acceptable to educated public opinion in Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL : Prior to 1906 it was the practice of the Intermediate Education Board to publish their Rules and programmes as soon as they had been laid before Parliament, thereby anticipating the approval of Parliament. In 1906 the Rules for 1907 were disallowed by Parliament after they had been published by the Board. In that case it became necessary for the Board to withdraw the Rules which had been issued, and as these Rules were on sale by booksellers throughout the country it was impossible to secure that all the copies should be returned. In view of the inconvenience thus caused, the Board decided not to publish their Rules for 1908 until they had become indefeasible. It is open to head-masters and others to make representations to the Board in favour of any modifications which they may desire in the Rules for future years.

MR. FLYNN : Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that for many years past the Intermediate Education Board have followed the example of the Department of Technical Instruction and have laid a draft of the programme before the parties interested, and that afterwards two of the Commissioners have met a Committee and discussed details ?

MR. BIRRELL : I think that is a very desirable method.

MR. FLYNN : I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of

Ireland whether the income of the Intermediate Education Board (Ireland) under Section 3 of the Customs and Excise Act, 1890, has declined from the sum of £71,400 in 1900 to £48,225 in 1906, and the rate of payment of the school grant for each successful pupil has been reduced on the following scale within the past four years; in the preparatory grade by 45 per cent., in the junior grade by 28·5 per cent., in the middle grade by 47·0 per cent., and in the senior grade by 46·0 per cent., with corresponding reductions in respect to honour pupils; and, if so, whether, in view of the fact that this decrease in the board's income is a direct result of the diminished consumption of drink in Ireland, he will make representation to the Treasury that funds should be supplied from some other source to enable this work of secondary education to be carried on in an efficient manner, and to place the board in such a position that the main source of its income should no longer depend upon the continuance of the consumption of alcoholic drink in Ireland.

Mr. BIRRELL: I understand that the figures quoted in the Question are approximately correct. I am informed, however, that the reduction in the amount of the capitation fees is due mainly to the increase in the numbers of students in the pass and honour lists, and in a less degree to the decrease in the amount received from the Local Taxation Account. The point raised in the latter part of the Question is one which deserves consideration at a suitable opportunity, but I am not at present in a position to make any statement upon it. I should, however, remind the hon. Member that the board's revenue from the Local Taxation Account is not dependent upon the consumption of drink in Ireland alone, but upon the thirst of the United Kingdom generally.

Mr. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that one result of this policy is that the income of the board diminishes proportionately with the increase of temperance in the country?

Mr. BIRRELL: The subject is one which requires consideration.

### Irish Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether arrangements will be made that the next meeting of the All Ireland Council of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction shall not be held until the new vice-president has been appointed and taken up the duties of the position.

Mr. BIRRELL: Arrangements have been made for holding the next meeting of the Council of Agriculture on 16th and 17th instant. Notices to that effect were sent to the members a month ago.

Mr. LONSDALE: Who has been appointed vice-president of the Board?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. That does not arise out of the Answer.

### Shillelagh Bench of Magistrates.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Shillelagh bench is composed of nine Protestant magistrates and one Catholic, the latter being the *ex officio* representative of the district council; and whether, in view of the fact that the population of the county is over 80 per cent. Catholic, he will draw the attention of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland to the amount of representation of the majority of the people in the Shillelagh Petty Sessions Court.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Lord Chancellor informs me that he believes that two of the nine justices who attend the Petty Sessions mentioned are Catholics: otherwise the facts are as stated in the Question. The Lord Chancellor is considering the question of appointing for this district a gentleman whose name was recently brought before him.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Shillelagh District Council have considered it necessary, in the interests of the public, to pass resolutions calling attention to the uncertain attendance of magistrates at Shillelagh Petty Sessions, the absence of justices not infrequently compelling the adjournment of the Court, thus causing serious loss and inconvenience to litigants; and whether he will communicate with the Lord Chancellor of

Ireland with a view to providing some remedy in this case.

MR. BIRRELL: I have referred this Question to the Lord Chancellor, who informs me that there is a fair attendance of magistrates at the Petty Sessions mentioned. During the past year there were two occcasions upon which only one magistrate attended, but on no occasion was the Court adjourned for want of the attendance of a magistrate.

### Land Purchase in Wicklow—Case of Thomas Whelan.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Thomas Whelan, of Aghowle, county Wicklow, is now a defaulting purchaser under the Land Act, 1903; that his holding was recently put up for sale by the Estates Commissioners, but, owing to the amount of the annuity, no bid was made; whether he is aware that Whelan had to sign a second-term agreement before purchasing; that the landlord, Earl Fitzwilliam, charged the tenant twenty-four and a half years purchase, and added to the purchase money two years arrears of rent; that the rateable valuation of the holding, including 5s. for the house, was £1, while the annuity payable on the purchase is £1 9s. 6d.; will he say whether any valuation of Whelan's holding was made before the statutory second term was fixed, or before the sale was sanctioned by the Commissioners; if so, who was the valuer; were the Commissioners satisfied that this was an economic holding; and whether, in the interests of the ratepayers, he will cause inquiry to be made into all the circumstances of this case.

MR. BIRRELL: The tenant purchaser referred to in the Question purchased his holding at a price within the zones under the Act of 1903. Inspection, therefore, was unnecessary. The holding was recently put up for sale owing to the non-payment of a year's annuity, but no bid was received The second term rent was fixed by agreement before the Act of 1903 was passed. When such rents are fixed by agreement, the holdings are not inspected by a valuer. I am not aware of any reason why an inquiry into the matter should be held, and in any event I have no power to direct such an inquiry.

### Grazing Farms—Protection for Occupiers.

MR. ARKWRIGHT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how many grazing farms were occupied in the counties of Galway, Mayo, Roscommon, Leitrim, and Westmeath, on 1st November, 1906; how many have been subsequently surrendered in consequence, or in fear of intimidation; and how many police are now employed in affording protection to the occupiers of grazing farms in the above-mentioned areas.

MR. BIRRELL: I have no information which would enable me to reply to the first two parts of the Question. The only method that I am aware of by which the number of occupied grazing farms could be ascertained would be to direct the police to take a census of such farms, and I do not see that any useful purpose would be served by doing so. Assuming that any such farms have been surrendered, it is obvious that though the police might surmise the reasons for such surrender they could have no definite knowledge on the subject. Inquiries are being made as to the last part of the Question, and I shall be prepared to reply if the hon. Member should see fit to renew the inquiry after a few days.

### Irish Board of Agriculture—Travelling Veterinary Inspector.

MR. DELANY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the appointment of travelling veterinary inspector to the Department has yet been made; and, if not, will he see that in making the appointment due regard shall be had to the number of experienced and well-qualified Catholic Irishmen eligible for the post, and also to the desirability of a more equal distribution of public appointments in Ireland, and above all that no further importations shall be made in filling positions under the Irish Agricultural Department.

MR. BIRRELL: I beg to refer to my Answer to the Question on this subject put by the hon. Member for South Down on 1st instant.†

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 855.

### Irish Finance.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, as President of the Local Government Board, on what date the sum of £150,000 was transferred from the Petty Sessions Clerks Fund (Ireland) to the credit of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, and how and at what rate of interest has it been invested; has the sum of £70,000 from the Irish Development Grant also been transferred and similarly been invested; whether it is proposed to replace the annual sum of £9,000 intended to be provided last session by the abolition of two Judgeships of the High Court (Ireland) and the reduction of the Irish Lord Chancellor's salary; and whether the contributions of £6,000 per annum from the residue of the Exchequer Grant under the Purchase of Land Act, 1891, have been duly made for 1906 and 1907.

Mr. BIRRELL: The sum of £150,000 was transferred, in the shape of investments, from Petty Sessions Clerks Fund to the Labourers Cottage Fund on various dates in November and December last. The investments consist of four per cent. Railway Debenture Stock amounting to £118,000 and Consols amounting to £31,000. The £70,000 from the Irish Development Grant has not yet been transferred, but steps to that end are now being taken. In reply to the third paragraph of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to the Judicature (Ireland) Bill now before Parliament. The contribution of £6,000 for the year 1906–7 has been paid over to the Local Government Board.

### Swinford Guardians.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to a meeting of the Swinford Union Distress Committee on 16th April, 1907, at which allegations of theft were made against two members of the Swinford Board of Guardians; whether the relief works in Swinford have been suspended on account of the thefts, which have been exposed by the Paymaster; whether the Board has condoned or condemned these irregularities; and whether he has received or will call for a Report from the Local Government Board upon the case.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board have received from the Swinford Distress Committe a resolution in which the Committee make allegations of the nature indicated in the Question against two members of their own body. The Committee have called upon these members to resign, and have asked the Board to take action if they should fail to do so. The matter is under the consideration of the Board.

### Irish Land Purchase Frauds.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in view of the recent judicial comments on the facilities for fraud afforded by the zones in the Land Act of 1903, and the inclusion of extraneous debts, real and fictitious, with the price of land for the purpose of obtaining public money, whether the Treasury will require a record to be kept of all additions to real price, so far as the zone system allows the detection of those additions, and does not empower the Commissioners or any Court to prevent them.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: No, Sir; this is not a matter for the Treasury.

### Irish Board of Works.

Mr. DELANY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in addition to securing for his brother the chairmanship of the Irish Board of Works, and exceptionally rapid advancement for his personal clerks, Sir Robert Holmes has been instrumental in securing appointments in the Irish Civil Service for the following relatives of personal friends, Sir David Harrel, two sons, and Sir Patrick Coll, two sons and a son-in-law; and whether he will take steps to prevent such appointments being made in the future.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I must refer the hon. Member to my Answer of the 23rd ultimo.[†]

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): Has not the Irish Lord Chancellor recently appointed his brother-in-law to a very high office?

*Mr. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question.

---

[†] See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1576–7.

### Irish Land Act—Treasury Rules.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the admission of the Treasury that the amendments proposed to be made in the Treasury Rules under the Land Act of 1903 will not in any way secure either the purchasers or the ratepayers against the losses consequent upon the present system of paying money irrespective of value, will the House of Commons be afforded an opportunity of discussing those amendments before their adoption; and, if so, when.

I beg also to ask the Prime Minister, seeing that exorbitancy of price in excess of value constitutes the greatest danger in connection with land purchase finance, and that the proposed amendments of Treasury Rules afford no protection in that respect, whether the promised discussion of that subject will be so arranged as to allow the method of inflating prices and inflating bonus to be dealt with.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The proposed amendment of the Treasury Rules is for the sole purpose of enabling the working balance on the account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund to be used in order to avoid charging local taxation grants in full with purely temporary charges—viz., arrears and interest on investments accrued but not received. I do not consider that there is any need for discussion on this small amendment. There is no power to deal in the Treasury Rules with the matters referred to in the Questions.

### Carndonagh Mails.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General what steps, if any, are being taken to have the grievance in respect of the delivery and despatch of mails to and from Carndonagh remedied; and whether, having regard to the loss and inconvenience to the public from the present late delivery, he will inquire into the matter and have an improvement effected.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: I sent the hon. Member an Answer yesterday, explaining the circumstances in regard to the service in question.

### Marriage and Hereditary Disease.

*Captain FABER: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the fact that several State legislatures in America have passed Bills to prevent marriages taking place unless both parties are, in the opinion of a qualified physician, free from disease transmissible to their children; and whether he will consider the desirability of introducing a similar Bill here.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not propose to undertake legislation on this subject this session.

### Butter Bill.

Mr. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when time will be given to conclude the debate on the Second Reading of the Butter and Margarine Bill.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We hope the Bill will secure its Second Reading to-day.

### Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, seeing that owing to the uncertainty as to whether His Majesty's Government will find time to pass an Eight Hours Mines Bill this session considerable unrest prevails among the miners, and that merchants decline to make new coal contracts over next year both for Home and export consumption, he will say if it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to pass a Bill of this character during this session; and, if he cannot find time, whether he will ask the House to meet in the autumn to deal with this measure.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I can hardly give a definite Answer to my hon. friend. The time required for passing a Bill of this sort will depend, of course, upon its reception when presented to the House.

Mr. MARKHAM: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are in this House a large number of Members connected with the mining industry, representing both employers and employed, and would it not therefore be possible for this House to deal with the whole Question without taking further evidence.

**Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN**: That does not arise out of the Question on the Paper. Perhaps the hon. Member will give notice of it.

### Illegal Fishing Prosecutions in Scotland.

**Sir GEORGE DOUGHTY** (Great Grimsby): I beg to ask the Prime Minister under what section of the Herring Fishery Act of 1889 the Scottish Office are entitled to prosecute British subjects for alleged illegal fishing in respect to an individual breach of the law or of any Scottish bye-law when no offence has been committed by the vessel or master to whom he is subordinate; whether there is any precedent for prosecuting a subordinate fisherman for any alleged offence at sea by any maritime power adjoining the North Sea or elsewhere; whether, now that the Norwegian Government have come to an understanding with the Scottish Office that they will not support Norwegian masters any more in cases of proceedings against them in Scotland for trawling in the Moray Firth, they will in future consider the desirability and justice of prosecuting the Norwegian master in accordance with precedent as the representative of the owners, and not prosecute English subordinate fishermen who had signed on in Norwegian vessels; and whether the Government will make it officially known at the fishery ports that the Government of Norway have surrendered their right to fish in the prohibited waters of the Moray Firth under the North Sea Convention and international law.

**Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN**: The Fishery Board by-law No. 10, issued in terms of Section 7 of the Act, 1889, provides that no person shall use any beam or otter trawl, and British subjects offending against this provision are clearly liable to prosecution. I am not aware whether subordinate fishermen have been proceeded against by other maritime powers. With regard to the last part of the hon. Member's Question, no surrender, such as is therein mentioned, has been made by the Norwegian Government, but as I informed the hon. Member on the 30th April the Norwegian Government have intimated that orders have been issued to the Fishery Director of Norway to warn all owners of Norwegian fishing boats who trawl in the Moray Firth to cease from so doing, and not to expect the support of their Government in the case of proceedings against them in Scotland.

**Sir GEORGE DOUGHTY**: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last paragraph of my Question?

**Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN**: If it is usual no doubt it will be done. If it is not usual perhaps the hon. Member will put another Question.

**Mr. STANLEY WILSON**: Is the right hon. Gentleman in favour of English fishermen being accorded the same terms as the foreign fishermen?

**Mr. SPEAKER**: Order, order!

---

### SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Munro Ferguson; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Stewart-Smith.

Report to lie on the Table.

---

## *NEW BILLS.*

### PRIMOGENITURE BILL.

"To alter the Law relating to the descent of land upon an Intestacy," presented by Mr. Arnold Herbert; supported by Mr. Micklem, Mr. Evans, Mr. Stewart-Smith, Mr. Stanger, Mr. Napier, Sir Albert Spicer, Mr. Herbert Craig, and Mr. Haworth; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 4th June, and to be printed. [Bill 186.]

### RESTRAINT OF TRADE (SHOPS) BILL.

"To render null and void certain provisions in shop assistants' agreements," presented by Mr. Seddon; supported by Mr. Frederick Edwin Smith, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Scott, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Price, and Mr. Clement Edwards; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 5th June, and to be printed. [Bill 187.]

### SUNDAY TRADING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To regulate and control Sunday Trading in Scotland," presented by Mr. Cameron Corbett; to be read a second time, upon Wednesday, 5th June, and to be printed. [Bill 188.]

### PETTY SESSION CLERKS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Clerks of Petty Sessions in Ireland," presented by Mr. Sloan; supported by Mr. Wolff, Mr. Crean, and Mr. Flynn; to be read a second time upon Friday, and to be printed. [Bill 189.]

---

### WAYS AND MEANS [24TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for further Consideration of First Resolution, "That Income-tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound."

**MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS** (Sheffield, Ecclesall) moved an Amendment to reduce the income-tax from 1s. to 11d. in the £. He pointed out that successive Chancellors of the Exchequer in their Budget statements had distinctly said that the income-tax payer ought to be the first to receive relief in respect of the extra war taxation, and yet, while indirect taxation had been reduced, the income-tax had remained unchanged since 1904. A high income-tax was an undue burden upon trade and industry, and acted not only upon profits but upon wages, and it reduced, if it did not take away, the great financial reserve which a low income-tax gave us in time of emergency. Another reason against a high income-tax was the fact that the death duties taken together amounted to more than 2s. in the £. Why was it that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was driven to keep the income-tax at 1s.? It was because during the last thirty or forty years sources of revenue had been dropped which could not be resorted to now. They had been dropped gradually, until the right hon. Gentleman had come down to a very few sources, viz., liquor, tobacco, tea, and sugar. Would the right hon. gentleman or anybody suggest that the duties on these articles could be raised? He thought not. Then, where was he to get his money to meet future expenditure? He was afraid that as the country progressed in population and wealth, we should find that our expenditure would go on increasing from year to year, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have to resort to other sources of revenue. At to what those sources should be, some would suggest that commodities coming from foreign countries should pay a small moderate duty for the use of our markets. It would be in many cases paid by the foreigners themselves, and it would bring in a very large revenue. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to hold some hope that next year, at all events, the income-tax payer would be relieved of a portion of the burden of war taxation which he had borne till now with so much patience.

**MR. FELL** (Great Yarmouth) seconded the Amendment as a protest against the 1s. rate being considered the normal rate in a time of peace like the present. In the past ten years we had incurred enormous war expenditure, and the income-tax had gone up to as much as 1s. 4d. in the £. But notwithstanding that high rate, the average for the past ten years had only been 11d. and a fraction. If they went back to the Crimean War, 52 years ago, the average for ten years at that time was only 9¼d., and taking the whole sixty years it had been only 7d. in the £. Now in a time of peace they were told it could not be reduced below 1s., and he feared that the Chancellor of the Exchequer looked upon that as the normal rate. Mr. Gladstone at one time spoke of abolishing it altogether, but it was clear that such a step was now totally outside the range of practical politics. The normal rate of the income-tax before the war was 8d., and it had stood at that for years. No one expected it to be raised or reduced. But to keep the tax at 1s. was a 50 per cent. increase, and an extremely serious matter. When the tax was raised from 8d. to 1s., and then to 1s. 4d., it was thought the increase would be temporary, and it was paid. But if they made it 1s. and then raised it to 1s. 4d., and then to 1s. 6d., it was very questionable whether it would be paid with the same facility. If the tax was raised above the rate of 8d., the increase came out of the pockets of the saving classes in a cash form, which entailed one of two things, either that they had to diminish their expenses, which meant a decrease of their spending power and a consequent decrease of wealth and labour in the country, or it must come out of the amount put aside as savings, which formed the very mainspring of the progress and enterprise of the country. It was the small income-tax payers who really were the saving class, and provided the funds out of which great enterprises were built up. When a war broke out and the income-tax was raised, these people cut down their expenses, probably thinking that the income-tax would shortly come back to its normal rate. But if they saw that the increased tax was going to become permanent, in all probability throughout the country they would cut down their expenses (he would be sorry to think for a moment that they would give up their habits of saving); that would mean a decrease of spending power, and it was on their savings that the tax would bear. He thought that some hon. Members on the other side would agree with them that at a time like the present some effort should be made to reduce this taxation. On these grounds he had great pleasure in seconding the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'one shilling,' and insert the words 'elevenpence,"—(*Mr. Samuel Roberts,*)—instead thereof:—

Question proposed, "That the words 'one shilling,' stand part of the said Resolution."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said it was only out of respect to the hon. Gentlemen who had just spoken that he rose to say one or two words on this subject. The case had been put in a very moderate and able way by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Ecclesall Division; he had nothing to complain of in regard to the manner in which he had presented it to the House. The main point of his argument seemed to be directed against the expediency of having an income-tax at all except as an emergency tax. To keep the income-tax at some rate or another had necessarily come to be a permanent part of our financial machinery, but the statement had been wrongly imputed to him, though he had disclaimed it more than once, that the income-tax should be kept permanently at 1s. He had never expressed nor held the opinion that the income-tax should permanently remain at the figure of 1s. in the £. Therefore the sole question was whether, having regard to our financial position, any ground had been made out for a reduction. The hon. Gentleman had adduced a new argument or one entirely new in his experience, that if they abolished the income-tax they would put out of employment the persons now engaged in its collection. He had the greatest possible desire not to reduce the revenue, but he did not think that the rentention of a tax would be justified on the ground that its abolition might lead to the diminution of the collecting machinery, and therefore the number of Government employees. But as a matter of fact, if they looked at the past history of the tax, during the years from 1806 to 1816, when the country was very much poorer than it was now, they would find that the tax was at the rate of 2s. in the £, and that burden was willingly borne by our ancestors.

MR. FELL: That was when there was a war.

MR. ASQUITH quite agreed. But if they referred to the Crimean War they should also refer to the South African War. He was pointing out that in the early part of last century, when the country was much poorer, our ancestors tolerated an income-tax of 2s. in the £, and managed to live and thrive under that staggering burden.

MR. FELL: It was taken off immediately.

MR. ASQUITH said he agreed that it was taken off immediately; but there was a considerable margin of elasticity between 1s. and 2s., if the tax should ever again be raised to that figure. He did not think that was likely; at least, he hoped not. But, as a matter of fact, they were, under his Budget proposals, giving considerable relief to the income-tax payers of the country, not merely in the case of small incomes, but in the case of earned incomes up to £2,000 a year. These incomes would pay 9d. in the £, and when they took into account the abatements which were allowed, together with this relief, they would find that a very large class, by far the larger body of the income-tax payers, paid on the average not more than 5d., 7d., or 8d. in the £. Therefore, whatever arguments might be adduced in favour of this reduction, he thought they were very considerably minimised when the House took into consideration the actual relief that was being given. He was afraid it was impossible for him to go any further at the present time, and he hoped the House would assent to the retention of the duty at the figure to which it was raised by his predecessor in office.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) urged that there was an obligation on the Commissioners of Inland Revenue to look carefully into the income-tax with a view to placing it on a perfectly fair basis, so that a man, in paying it, could feel that he was only paying what was honestly due from him; and it was for that reason, as regarded the question of unearned income, that he wished to say a few words. One point which he did not think had been dealt with had reference to junior partnerships and this relief of 3d. in the £. Unless some steps were taken to place the matter on a different basis, in the case of a firm making £10,000 per annum, of which the junior partners received £1,000 per annum, the junior partners would have no opportunity or means so to arrange their claim form exemption that they would be able to take advantage of the 3d. in the £, to which they were as much entitled as any other payers of income-tax. Another point was how the Chancellor of the Exchequer intended to deal with those concerns which were converted into limited companies. Many small concerns which had a profit of from £1,500 to £2,000 a year were entitled to claim the relief of 3d. in the £. Many businesses, for family or other reasons, were converted into limited companies. The shares in the new concern, representing goodwill or a small amount of capital, would receive dividends, and the question was whether those dividends were to be regarded as unearned income on which no relief was to be given. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that there was a very larger number who, for certain purposes, had converted their businesses into limited companies, and they would find themselves deprived of the relief given under the Bill. On the principle of averages, a man, when his average increased, was quite properly called upon to pay the income-tax in respect of it. When, on the other hand, his business was decreasing and his profits were going down, when he made a sudden and heavy loss, as from a colliery explosion, or some other adverse incident of business, then, at that very time, when his capital was all important to him, he was penalised by a demand for income-tax, which made the poor man poorer, and placed him in a very serious position. No one could complain if he only paid on the profits for that year, but it would be a most serious thing if a man had to pay when his business was showing a loss. His losses might be such as to make him bankrupt, and at the same time his creditors would have to pay a large amount in respect of income-tax based on profits which did not really exist. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider that question. He thoroughly appreciated the effect of the average, still he thought it was not a right thing, and it ought to be abolished.

MR. ASQUITH: I shall be very glad to do that

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER said that if the right hon. Gentleman was abolishing it in regard to a new business, he did not see why he could not do so in regard to others. There was no fairness whatever in making a man who had lost money pay a heavy sum in income-tax. He was rather sorry to see that the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not deal at the Colonial Conference with the question of Colonial companies and income-tax.

MR. ASQUITH: I have discussed that question with the Colonial Premiers at another conference.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER said he was glad to hear that. There were many other ways of dealing with preference than by duties, and they might very well consider whether they could not deal with this question so that shareholders of companies registered in this country but transacting the whole of their business in the Colonies should not have to pay income-tax both here and in the Colonies. With regard to the question of interest, he urged that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer taxed interest on the credit side, it was only fair and reasonable that he should make an allowance in respect of interest appearing on the debit side. The present practice was an absolutely dishonest attempt to extort money from income-tax payers. So long as they taxed a man's credit interest and did not make an allowance for his debit interest, so long would they have men saying, "We are dishonestly dealt with, and we will do the best we can to put ourselves straight in our own particular way." Honesty was the best policy, but if they swindled they must not be astonished if people endeavoured to get quits with them. In the matter of depreciation, the Inland Revenue distinctly swindled the public.

*MR. SPEAKER: I would remind the hon. Member that the only question immediately before the House is the reduction of the tax from 1s. to 11d.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER said he was contending that it should be reduced because the practices of the income-tax officials were not consistent with the principles of common honesty. If the income-tax was to remain at 1s., men ought to be made to feel that they were being honestly dealt with, and were not the victims of oppression. That could only be done if they applied the principles that obtained as between man and man in a mercantile community. If they applied principles which savoured of extortion, there would be a perpetual effort to evade the tax.

*MR. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, who was for several years Chancellor of the Exchequer in the late Conservative Government, speaking at Bristol, on 29th September, 1902, said—

> "They would remember that he told them that in the last seven years the ordinary expenditure of the country had increased at no less a rate than £5,500,000 a year! They could not go on that way. They must stop that rate of increase. If they did not what would happen? He would tell them. A 1s. income-tax would be utterly insufficient for the needs of the country even in time of peace: and all the people who complained now of the small taxation that had been imposed upon sugar and corn would be face to face with heavy taxation, not only on those articles but perhaps on other great articles of popular consumption. They would have changed their fiscal system from one of light taxation such as had prevailed for forty years, and under which the industries of the country had been enormously developed, to a system of heavy taxation which would keep those industries down."

There was the real explanation of income tax at 1s. in the £. Hon. Gentleman opposite during their ten years of power had increased the annual expenditure of the nation—chiefly by increase of armaments—by nearer £50,000,000 than £40,000,000 a year. Yet they complained of the taxes their profligate extravagance had made necessary. He hoped hon. Gentlemen on his side of the House would have their support when they endeavoured—as they meant to do—to get reduced the present bloated expenditure upon the Navy and the Army. They wanted the money for old-age pensions, of which he rejoiced to say the Chancellor had now definitely given a promise, for which promise, even if it meant continuance of the income-tax at 1s. in the £ he desired heartily to thank him.

*MR. GEORGE FABER (York) said it was perfectly true that they were not entitled to say that the Chancellor of the Exchequer held out the prospect to the House of Commons that an income-tax of 1s. in the £ must remain for all time, but the right hon. Gentleman certainly did say that—

> "The Chancellor of the Exchequer ought to budget not for one year but for several years."

That indicated that a 1s. income-tax would remain for some years to come. But how did the Chancellor of the Exchequer justify a war income-tax and war indirect taxation in a time of peace? The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "What is a war tax? It is not a tax that is put on to last during a war and to come to an end the moment peace is concluded and your Army is withdrawn from the field. It is a tax which is put on to meet the extra burden imposed on the country by waging war, and

> so long as that extra burden remains—and it remains to the tune of £130,000,000 of extra debt—the claim of a war tax to be removed is, in my opinion, an inadmissible claim."

The right hon. Gentleman therefore based his action on the proposition that we were not entitled to peace taxation until this £130,000,000 was paid off. But preaching was one thing and practice another. The preaching of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the impossibility of putting taxation on a peace basis while the war debt remained differed from his practice, because the only new debt reduction this year was £1,500,000, apart from the action of the Old and New Sinking Fund Acts, which was automatic, and this £1,500,000 was ear-marked for the purpose of old-age pensions next year; so that after this year we should be paying nothing at all extra to reduce the national debt. He would like to ask the right hon. Gentleman what exactly he meant when he said in his Budget speech that the delay in the collection of the income-tax was almost entirely due to the persons directly assessed, and to whom he was going to give relief. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "We intend that the English machinery shall be levelled up so that it may with equal efficiency correspond to the admirable machinery at work in Scotland."

Did he mean by that that the income-tax in England which was not collected until towards the end of the financial year was collected at a much earlier period in Scotland?

Mr. ASQUITH said that the law was the same for both countries, but the practice was different.

*Mr. GEORGE FABER said that he wanted to see how this particular proposition was going to work out. Were the income-tax payers in England to pay at an earlier date than hitherto?

Mr. ASQUITH, on a point of order, asked Mr. Speaker what possible relevance the hon. Gentleman's observations in regard to the screwing up of the collection of the income-tax had to the reduction of the income-tax to 11d. as proposed in the Amendment.

*Mr. SPEAKER said that it was in order to argue that, if a larger revenue was anticipated from a more rigid system of collection, the income-tax should be smaller in amount.

*Mr. GEORGE FABER said that it had appeared to him that the questions he was putting to the Chancellor of the Exchequer were relevant in the sense suggested by Mr. Speaker; and no doubt with his ordinary courtesy the right hon. Gentleman would give him an answer at some later period of the debates on these matters,

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he had asked the other day whether the 1s. income-tax would be paid upon pensions, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the question was open to argument. Since then he had received many letters on this subject from many classes of pensioners. He would put to the Chancellor of the Exchequer three typical cases in which he thought the reduced rate of 9d. should be allowed. They were those of a man who had retired from the Irish Constabulary after forty years' service, an English Civil servant who had served for a full pension, and an Indian Civil servant who had served thirty-five years. He contended that the pensions they received and the allowances made in the case of Indian Civil servants to their widows and orphans were nothing but deferred pay, and therefore should not be liable to the full rate of income-tax. He knew there was an impression that Indian Civil servants had large savings, but surely that tradition had gone for ever. Very few of the Indian Civil servants, for instance, brought home any savings after thirty-five years' service, and when they came back it was quite impossible for them to take part in public life, unless they had private resources, and they were, in almost all cases, owing to age and other circumstances, unable to earn any money in England by means of other pursuits. He submitted that the Irish, English, and Indian Civil servants were deserving of consideration. [An Hon. Member: And the Scottish.] He had always thought the Scottish people were capable of looking after themselves, but he had no objection to say that he thought that the Irish, English, Indian, and Scottish Civil servants deserved consideration. They were now expected to feed other people's children as well as their own, and in this way the rates were ever increasing. An income-tax of £50 on a total income of £1,000 a year was very heavy indeed in the case of men who had been accustomed to good positions and had done the State some service. He did not exclude any persioners. A retired ambassador was the man who had the largest pension, and he did not hesitate to say hardly anyone could be poorer than an ex-ambassador who had no resources beyond his pension. He urged the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with all the insistence of which he was possessed, to give all pensions the lower rate of income-tax. The Indian Civil servant had a particularly strong case, as he contributed at least half, and often nearly the whole of the capital sum from which his pension came, which capital sum was lost to his family on his death. He read letters from gentlemen possessing such pensions, and other pensions showing the history of such cases, and how unjust it would be to treat such pensions like unearned income. He urged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give the matter his most earnest consideration.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) supported the Amendment because he thought the proposed abatement would not meet the whole case, although it might appear to accord with the wishes of a great number of people. The income-tax produced £32,000,000, and at the rate of abatement proposed the reduction should be, not £1,250,000, but £3,250,000. The reason the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not adopt the larger figure was, he supposed, that he did not think that his abatement would have much effect. Moreover, the three following Budget Resolutions more than took away the advantage which was supposed to be given. Another serious point was that under the present income-tax system no one was supposed to make a full return of all his income, but under the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman persons desiring to claim the reduction would have to show not only that their income did not exceed £2,000, but what was their total income from dividends on the capital which they held. That would have a very serious effect upon City and professional men. In the case of a man whose income amounted to £2,000 altogether, £1,500 a year from his business and £500 the interest on £10,000 which he had saved, in order to get the 3d. rebate he would have to disclose not only that he was earning £1,500 a year, but also his capital, which would be a very serious matter for him. The Chancellor of the Exchequer no doubt would say that all the officials were sworn to secrecy, but there were a large number of income-tax Commissioners, and they, although very estimable people, might very well talk to their wives and families or other people. One of the Commissioners was a member of the Stock Exchange, and under this proposal all the 500 members of that body would have to disclose their capital to him, which was not a desirable state of things.

Mr. ASQUITH: They can go before Special Commissioners if they choose.

Sir F. BANBURY said that might be so, but he believed the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman would be detrimental to those engaged in the business of the country. He thought the advisors of the right hon. Gentleman were perfectly well aware of that, and that was why they had allowed for a rebate of only £1,250,000 instead of £3,250,000. The same thing would happen in the case of the professional man. A barrister, for instance, might not get all the briefs he thought he ought to have and he would not want to disclose to the public and solicitors how few he received. He had been asked in the city to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman, although he was afraid he should not succeed in getting him to alter his determination, to the question of wasting securities. It was very hard that the wasting securities should be dealt with in the way in which they were by the Income Tax Commissioners. He knew of the case of a company where the capital was £1,000,000. In order to provide for the possible working out of the field of operations in seven years over £311,000 was put aside, and £145,000 was similarly treated for depreciation of machinery and buildings, making a total of £457,000, and leaving available for dividend only £143,000. The income-tax, however, lumped all these sums together and charged income-tax on over £600,000. Not only that, they had to pay on that £457,000 for seven years, and if any of the unfortunate shareholders died their estates had to pay the death duties as well. That was really a state of things which could not be defended. It had this disadvantage that, instead of encouraging thrift in companies and individuals and leading them to set aside money to provide for depreciation, the State penalised them for doing so. The effect of the whole of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals went in the direction of penalising thrift.

Mr. ASQUITH: I am not responsible for this practice. It has been in existence for sixty-five years.

Sir F. BANBURY understood that the Government were returned to remedy abuses and to redress grievances. Let the House consider the case of a man with £1,900 a year. If he spent the £1,900 a year he would pay 9d. income-tax, whereas if he spent only £500 a year and saved the rest and in consequence obtained his income from his savings he would have to pay 1s. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman was as responsible for this injustice as any other Chancellor of the Exchequer during the last sixty-five years.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) agreed with the last speaker that a man who had saved money out of income was entitled as a matter of justice and equity to pay at the lower rate both upon his earned and unearned income in the year. He thought the abatement should act equally upon the income of the earned part and upon that which was derived from capital which had been saved out of income. In Scotland, while they were eager and burning to pay this tax, they did so at the point of the bayonet. They liked to come to the collector and pay their doles at the right time, but in this regard they were driven in Scotland to pay much sooner than in England. He wished to know what the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to do to mend matters. The House might not know but the Chancellor of the Exchequer was well aware that there was a serious difference between the system adopted for Scotland and that adopted for England. In Scotland, after the income-tax was assessed, the collection of the tax was effected by a revenue officer armed with all the powers conferred upon him by the State. He knocked at one's door at the beginning of January, and if he was not successful in collecting the tax he knocked again at the beginning of February. If the tax was not paid then, about the 15th of February came the process of law. The collection was effected by public officers, who discharged their duty without fear or favour. In England, after the tax was assessed, collectors, who had no special qualifications for the office, were told to collect it. They might make a call and be put off, until in some cases the tax was not collected till June. Only that evening he had been told by an hon. Member that he never paid his income-tax until the middle of June, and saw no reason why he should pay it earlier. Why did not the right hon. Gentleman take steps to improve the collection in England? If the tax was collected in England half as well as in Scotland it would be collected more easily and the yield would be greater. The income-tax was a farmed tax collected by people who were paid for collecting it. The Scottish method was a far better one and compelled his countrymen who did not care to part with their money to pay up in February. A platonic explanation of agreement with what he said was not enough. A little more was required from the Chancellor of the Exchequer than the profession of a desire or even a promise to collect this money better. This was no new complaint, but it was put into a more concrete form because associations were being formed in Scotland having for their object the better collection of the tax. Now that everyone was to be swept into the net it would fall with much greater weight than ever before upon the shoulders of the people. If the right hon. Gentleman meant to catch those who had possibly escaped before he would have to give some promise that the collection of the tax in England should pass into the hands of gentlemen who would discharge their duty with regularity. Moreover, while the financial year ended on the 5th of April and the income up to the end of that year was the income upon which the income-tax was collected, the payment of that tax was due on the 1st of January. Men were called upon, in fact, to pay the tax before it was due. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would also look into the incidence of the tax. There were a great many people who were going to be hard hit by it, therefore he desired that the tax should be collected under the best conditions. It would be no doubt a serious thing for the country to lose a quarter of the year's income, but they in Scotland complained that they were compelled to pay their income-tax in the middle of February which was too soon. He would not be surprised if the right hon. Gentleman had greater trouble in the future than he had had in the past to collect the tax in Scotland. He himself felt that he would be quite justified in telling his friends in Scotland not to pay until the system of collection was altered in England. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give some assurance that he would take the measures necessary to remedy the injustice done to Scotland in this matter.

*Sir J. JARDINE (Roxburghshire) said he did not intend to digress, but would keep strictly to the point of the shilling income-tax. So far as he could ascertain there was no expectation among the commercial or financial classes that the income-tax would be further reduced until more of the debt caused by the Boer War had been paid off. If they came to the capitalist classes—those who invested in Consols or holders of good securities that went up and down with Consols—there was general satisfaction in their minds at the retention of the shilling limit, because they knew it was the only way of stopping the depreciation of their capitalised securities. Amongst the thousands of income-tax payers a vast number would benefit by the reductions already proposed. The great majority of income-tax payers were most eager for the war when it began, and again at the General Election of 1900, they showed by their votes that they wished to spend more on it. With £138,000,000 sterling of War Debt still to pay, they were fully aware as honest men that they must keep on paying the shilling income-tax until the national credit was improved.

Sir THOMAS LOWE (Birmingham, Edgbaston) said he wished the Chancellor of the Exchequer seriously to consider whether 1s. was not too high a figure for the income-tax in time of peace. Personally he thought 1s. was far too high a figure, and he would vote for any reduction which was proposed. This tax ought to be looked upon in regard to its effect upon commerce and the general prosperity of the country. However much one might hear of the large volume of exports and imports, it was a fact that the trade of the country was far from good at the present time. Many hon. Members would agree that they were not receiving so large an income as they were two or three years ago. The only people who were receiving as much as they did in former years were the members of the Government who drew large salaries which were not subject to any fluctuation. If the income-tax was not reduced it would tend to check enterprise, cripple industry, and destroy confidence. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find that it would extend trade and improve the prosperity of the country in other directions if he accepted the Amendment, and the difference would be more than made up from other sources of revenue. It was far more just and also expedient not to apply too much direct taxation. The income-tax was too great a temptation to Chancellors of the Exchequer, because it was easy to collect and obviated the necessity of the Chancellor of the Exchequer exercising his ingenuity in other directions. As a means of conducing to the prosperity of the country it would be wiser and sounder finance to look out for other sources of taxation, and he hoped that when the right hon. Gentleman produced his Budget next year he would not only consider the income-tax from the point of view of revenue, but also from the point of view of the effect it would have upon the general trade and prosperity of the country.

Mr. MYER (Lambeth, N.) asked what was going to be done in regard to incomes from profit sharing in various companies. There were a good many men who were in receipt of small salaries and the rest of their income was from shares in various companies. He thought that such men should have the advantage of the reduction of 3d. in the £. If that was not done the companies would probably alter their arrangements and pay their men in the form of increased salaries instead of partly in the form of dividends. He also asked the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider his decision not to allow a three years' average to be taken. The proposal to pay the income-tax for the present year came as a double hardship to many firms whose profits had been very bad. He knew that the whole question was very much involved and complicated, but he thought such people as he had mentioned should have some consideration from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Mr. ASQUITH reminded the House of the arrangement made not to continue the debate for more than an hour and a half, and suggested that a decision should now be taken.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the Opposition did not desire to discuss this Resolution further, and as regarded the remaining Resolutions he hoped they would be passed rapidly. But by passing those Resolutions *sub silentio* it must not be taken that the Opposition accepted them; they retained full liberty to discuss the questions involved at a later stage.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 323; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 163.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert

Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax )
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)

Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Atherstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'm'pt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H.(Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim,S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wilson,Hon.C.H.W.(Hull,W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balfour,RtHn.A.J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G(Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks-
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R.(Marylebone, E.)
Clark,Geo. Smith (Belfast, N.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland,Sir FredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey, F.W.F(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway,Rt.Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton,Hon.Frederick Wm.
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson,Wm. G.(Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E.Howard
Walker,Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent,Mid.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Samuel Roberts and Mr. Fell.

Resolution agreed to.

## WAYS AND MEANS [24TH APRIL] REPORT.

Order read, for Consideration of Second and Subsequent Resolutions.

Resolutions considered.

Second Resolution.

### ESTATE DUTY.

2. "That in the case of persons dying on or after the nineteenth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, the rates of Estate duty under section seventeen of The Finance Act, 1894, be amended so that—

| Where the Principal Value of the Estate | Estate Duty shall be payable at the rate per cent. of | In-tead of |
|---|---|---|
| Exceeds— £ 150,000 and does not exceed £ 250,000 | Seven pounds - - - | Six pounds ten shillings |
| 250,000 " " 500,000 | Eight pounds - - - | Seven pounds |
| 500,000 , , 750,000 | Nine pounds - - - | Seven pounds ten shillings |
| 750,000 " " 1,000,000 | Ten pounds - - - | Seven pounds ten shillings |
| 1,000,000 " " 1,500,000 | Ten pounds on one million and eleven pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |
| 1,500,000 " " 2,000,000 | Ten pounds on one million and twelve pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |
| 2,000,000 " " 2,500,000 | Ten pounds on one million and thirteen pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |
| 2,500,000 , " 3,000,000 | Ten pounds on one million and fourteen pounds on the remainder | Eight pounds |
| 3,000,000 - - - - - - | Ten pounds on one million and fifteen pounds on the remainder. | Eight pounds |

Read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) said that after the arrangement which had been arrived at he hoped the discussion would not be continued. They would be allowed to debate this question upon a later occasion.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he could see his way to graduate more finely, and instead of jumping from 7 per cent. to 8 per cent. to go from 7 per cent. to 7·1 per cent., 7·2 per cent., and so on. In that way he would be able to get more money.

AN HON. MEMBER: It would be more trouble.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 329; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 164.)

## AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Jn. Emmott (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (Tower Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romford
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Healy, Timothy Michael
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Killbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal W.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.

Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Camarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W.E.B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athlestan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G Scott (Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mie End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dubartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W. (Hull, W.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balfour, Rt Hn A.S. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester)
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F.W.F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark

Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Hicks Beach and Mr. Watson Rutherford.

Third Resolution—

### INCOME-TAX (INCLUSION OF ALL OFFICES AND EMPLOYMENTS IN SCHEDULE E).

3. "That the Income-tax charged on offices or employments of profit, whether public or not, be charged under Schedule E in The Income-Tax Act, 1853."

Disagreed to.

Resolutions—

### INCOME-TAX (LIMITATION ON THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF DEDUCTIONS OR REPAYMENTS FOR WEAR AND TEAR).

4. "That no deduction or repayment be allowed in any year in respect of the diminished value, by reason of wear and tear, of any machinery or plant which, when added to the deductions or repayments allowed on that account in previous years, will make the aggregate amount of the deductions or repayments exceed the actual cost of the machinery or plant."

### INCOME-TAX (ABOLITION OF REPAYMENTS IN RESPECT OF ASSESSMENT ON AVERAGE INCOME).

5. "That any abatement, relief, or repayment of Income-tax under section one hundred and thirty-three of The Income-Tax Act, 1842, as amended by section six of The Revenue Act, 1865, shall cease."

### INCOME-TAX (ASSESSMENT ON TRADES, ETC., RECENTLY COMMENCED).

6. "That Income-tax charged under Schedule D in The Income-Tax Act, 1853, on professions, trades, or vocations shall, in the case of professions, trades, or vocations which have been set up or commenced within the three years on which the average income is to be computed under The Income-Tax Acts or within the year of assessment, be charged with reference to the actual profits or gains arising in the year of assessment."

Agreed to.

Ordered, "That it be an Instruction to the Gentlemen appointed to bring in a Bill upon the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on the 1st day of this instant May, and then agreed to by the House, that they do make provision therein pursuant to the Resolutions agreed to by the House this day."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

* * *

### LOCAL TAXATION GRANTS [CONSOLIDATED FUND].

Resolution reported, "That it is expedient that the following grants to Local Taxation Accounts, namely—(1) The Estate Duty grants paid under section nineteen of The Finance Act, 1894; and (2) The Agricultural Rates grant paid under section two of the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896; and (3) The Scottish Agricultural Rates grant paid under section three of The Agricultural Rates, Congested Districts, and Burgh Land Tax Relief (Scotland) Act, 1896, instead of being paid out of the revenues out of which they are payable under the present law, be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Fund, but in the case of the grants which are payable during the continuance of any temporary Act, only so long as that Act is continued, and that where under the present law the proceeds of any duties are paid to any local taxation account, a sum equal to the proceeds of those duties at their present rates be paid to that account out of the Consolidated Fund, and the actual proceeds of the duties be paid into the Exchequer."

*MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said this was a very important Resolution and he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would forgive him if he asked information on one or two points arising on it. He observed that it only alluded to a portion of the Imperial taxes paid into the Local Taxation Account. The licences for the retailing of beer and spirits, the ordinary Excise licences, gun licences, dog licences, licences for armorial bearings, and various things of that kind were all paid into the Local Taxation Account, but did not appear to come under this Resolution. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them that the change which he proposed was really a book-keeping change, and that it would not affect the local authorities at all. The right hon. Gentleman led the House to understand that the local authorities would benefit from any normal increase in the yield of these taxes. He did not quite understand how the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able correctly to apportion these amounts to the various counties and at the same time save the great amount of book-keeping which he led the House to believe would be saved through the proposed change. An important point to remember in dealing with Local Taxation Grants was that, while these contributions from the Imperial Exchequer had been increasing pretty regularly, at the same time the items of expenditure by the local authorities, to meet which these grants were given by the Imperial Exchequer, had been increasing very much more rapidly; and the result was that the balance of the charges which the Exchequer grants did not meet had fallen on the ratepayers. He understood that the Chancellor of the Exchequer wished to alter the arrangement in order to get into his net the Excise licences and among others the licences on motor cars; but apparently the right hon. Gentleman did not wish any benefit that might accrue from the issue of motor car licences to go to the local authorities. He submitted that that was a very important decision. In the case of local authorities the greater portion of their outlay apart from education had been on the upkeep of roads, which ought to be a national charge; and if the right hon. Gentleman was going to raise any considerable increase of revenue from licences on motor cars he ought to give the increase to the local authorities. They were the people who had to find the money to keep up the roads, and he submitted that the proceeds realised in that way ought to go to them and not to the Imperial Exchequer. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to give the House more information in regard to these changes, because he was afraid they might have serious consequences.

Mr. HARMOOD-BANNER said he would offer no apology for bringing before the House a matter of great importance to municipal and borough authorities. In his Budget speech the Chancellor of the Exchequer in referring to Imperial and local taxation stated that the local authorities would share in any natural growth—that was, they would receive exactly the same sum in any year as they received now—and then occurred the words "natural growth or natural diminution." He submitted to the House that the proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer meant a very heavy addition to the rates payable to the municipal authorities. He had taken very good opinion on this matter from several municipal treasurers, and he had had the opportunity of looking at the accounts of some municipal corporations. He found that in their opinion it would mean an additional 1d. in the £ in borough or city councils.

Mr. ASQUITH indicated dissent.

Mr. HARMOOD-BANNER said the right hon. Gentleman shook his head, but he would endeavour to establish that proposition. If there would be another opportunity of bringing this subject up on the Finance Bill, he had no wish to put the House to any inconvenience in stating the case now.

Mr. ASQUITH: There will be other opportunities.

Mr. HARMOOD-BANNER said that he was to have a meeting to-morrow with 259 representatives of municipal authorities, and this question would come up. He would be bound to tell them that this proposal was going to impose a large additional burden on their rates, and he would have liked to have had an opportunity of discussing it. In deference to the right hon. Gentleman, however, he felt bound to shorten his remarks. This was a most inequitable proposition, and it was going to take from boroughs and counties a very large amount of their funds. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to postpone the proposed change.

Mr. ASQUITH said the hon. Gentleman might safely tell his 259 friends that this would not impose a penny additional on any one of them. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman had better wait and see the Bill before he asserted the contrary. There would be a clause dealing with the matter inserted in the Bill. He had given an undertaking in his Budget speech, and if the Bill did not carry it out it could be amended. Not one halfpenny would be thrown on any of the local authorities. Did that satisfy the hon. Gentleman ?

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER said that what the right hon. Gentleman told them in his Budget speech was that they were to have the normal growth. But if there was a diminution, a less sum would be received and the local authorities would have to suffer.

MR. ASQUITH said that statement showed to him one of the advantages which the hon. Gentleman would have by waiting to see the Bill. If the hon. Gentleman found in the Bill any such clause, the clause would be amended to make it clear. As to what he himself had said about motor cars, he thought hon. Members had better wait until he brought in the precise proposals. He had never said that the taxation from motor cars would go to the Imperial Exchequer without any consideration of the local authorities. What he said was that the present system was absolutely inequitable. Under the present system the persons who got the benefit were the local authority in whose jurisdiction the license was taken out. That was the absurdity in the present position of things which he pointed out.

Resolution agreed to.

Ordered, That it be a further Instruction to the Gentlemen appointed to bring in a Bill upon the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means on the 1st day of this instant May, and then agreed to by the House, that they do make provision therein pursuant to the said Resolution.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

## FINANCE BILL.

"To grant certain Duties of Customs and Inland Revenue, to alter other Duties, and to amend the Law relating to Customs and Inland Revenue and the National Debt, and to make other provisions for the financial arrangements of the year," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 190.]

---

## POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said that this Bill was to enable the Postmaster-General to acquire land compulsorily in London, Chester, Bournemouth, Eastbourne, and Southgate for the public service. They had already powers of compulsory acquisition, but where there was a dispute as to the compensation to be paid, as in the case of Bournemouth, because of a technical point in a defective title, additional compulsory powers were necessary in order to avoid difficulties as between vendor and purchaser and the expense that might otherwise be incurred. He proposed, as soon as the Bill was given a Second Reading, to move its reference to a Select Committee, before which all parties interested would have an opportunity of appearing and discussing any question they desired to raise, or of making any suggestion that they might feel disposed to make. Any proposal they made would receive due consideration. The House would have an opportunity of discussing the Bill fully after it had come downstairs from the Select Committee. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said he could not understand why, if a voluntary agreement had been arrived at, compulsion should come in. He was sorry that Clause 1 was so incomprehensible. Then there was a serious difficulty in regard to Clause 9. He took that clause to mean that when the Postmaster-General saw a site of which he desired to take a part for a post office, he might do so without paying compensation for depreciation on account of severance. That seemed to him unfair, and he dared say that the drafting of the clause was so defective as to increase the charges of the legal profession.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) considered that some explanation was required as to the meaning of Clauses 6 and 9. He understood that under the Bill in cases where there was an agreement for the purchase of sites compulsory powers were given to extinguish the rights of owners of property who were under some disability. Clauses 6 and 9 were at any rate unusual, and he suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should issue a short memorandum showing the effect of this proposed legislation on previous legislation.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) thought that no Government Department ought to deal with the land of private individuals in the way proposed by this Bill. If the Bill were examined it would be found that a special exception was made in the favour of the Government so that the Postmaster-General could take a portion of a man's property compulsorily and damage the balance, without paying compensation for that damage. Other people would be required to take the whole, but it was in the power of the Postmaster-General arbitrarily to decide that he would only take a particular piece. The point he took was that the Government ought not to ask for powers of that character.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said there was nothing new in this Bill as compared with previous statutes. It had been drawn precisely in the form of former Bills of the same character. The hon. Member had misinterpreted the clause, which only said that when the Postmaster-General asserted that in his opinion severance of the piece of land required would not damage the rest he should be able to acquire it. If there was any dispute as to whether damage would be sustained by the severance the question would have to go before an arbitrator and a jury, and if the view of the Postmaster-General was not correct the Government would have to pay damages for the property which was injured. The question would be one for negotiation, and the Select Committee would be able to take measures to guard against any possible injustice. Anyone who had a grievance would be able to appear before the Committee and his case would be considered. After the Bill came back from the Committee they would be able to discuss these points with a view to removing any possible injustice.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) called attention to the fact that Clause 6 gave a power to the Post Office to stop up not only public rights of way but private rights of way. That provision being put in this year might lead to difficulty in future. Everybody knew that it was very difficult to look up the provisions of an Act of Parliament after two or three years, and Acts relating to Public Departments were not accessible as general public statutes were. Therefore, when a clause of this sort was slipped in, after two or three or four years people said it was a precedent. This Bill, therefore, if passed in its present form might seriously injure and curtail the rights of the public.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of Five Members, Three to be nominated by the House, and Two by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, "That all Petitions against the Bill presented Five clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the Petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents be heard against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill."

Ordered, "That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records."

Ordered, "That Three be the Quorum." —(*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*)

---

## BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [17th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said he did not wish in any way to obstruct the passage of this Bill, as he thought in many ways it was an excellent one. It was desirable, however, that butter substitutes should be labelled with some name which did not include the word "butter." That was the desire of the Dairy Farmers' Association, and he was asked to urge upon the Board of Agriculture that they should introduce provisions in the Bill which would ensure for the protection of agriculturists that butter substitutes containing 24 per cent. of moisture should be so described that the word "butter" was not used. That would prevent frauds upon agriculturists and also upon the consumer, who might be led to think he was consuming butter when the substance he was eating contained nothing of the kind.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said that the Lincolnshire Farmers' Union also strongly objected to the 24 per cent. of water allowed in butter substitutes. People who bought products called butter substitutes no doubt often thought they got butter. If it was possible for the Board of Agriculture to approve of a distinctive name to be given to these butter substitutes it would be a good thing. It seemed to him that if butter substitutes containing 24 per cent. of moisture were sold under such names as "milk-blended butter" it was quite possible that unwary purchasers might think they were getting an especially good article instead of what they were in fact purchasing. Therefore in the interests alike of farmers, butter makers, and consumers there should be some greater distinction made than existed at present. He hoped the hon. Gentleman would give full consideration to the wishes of the farmers.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS said the feeling of the Scottish farmers was exactly similar to that already expressed by the noble Lord. They considered the provision permitting the sale of butter substitutes containing 24 per cent. of moisture would not only be a danger to the public but permit unfair competition with the farmer. Under one clause of the Bill butter and margarine were both condemned if they contained more than 16 per cent. of moisture, but when it came to the so-called butter substitutes the Bill contemplated allowing 24 per cent. of moisture. There were many other points to which he might refer, but his purpose was served by making the House aware of the fact that the farmers of Scotland felt a grievance on the matter.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

---

## CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) opposed the Bill, which, he said, was divided into three parts. It gave leave to every criminal to appeal on any point of law which arose at the trial. He had no particular objection to that provision, for it had been recommended by a Royal Commission. But the present differed from any previous measures in that it allowed an appeal on any question of fact, and, with the leave of the Court of Appeal, it allowed an appeal from a sentence. When the hon. and learned Attorney-General introduced the Bill under the ten-minutes rule he dealt with the wide generality, which must always be attractive to the public, that every person convicted should have a right to state his case before a higher Court. It was only when they came to the particular facts of the case that they found these generalities broke down. One of the great objections to the measure was its expense. The taking of shorthand notes at every criminal trial at assizes or quarter sessions would be paid for by the country. If a person were convicted at quarter sessions he could apply to the Court of Criminal Appeal for leave to appeal, and he would be entitled to come, say, from the north of England to London at the expense of the taxpayers. In his opinion, if such an unlimited right to apply to the Court of Appeal for leave to appeal on every question of fact were allowed, the machinery of the Bill must inevitably break down, for the expense and the labour were too great for any tribunal effectively to carry through. The ground for leave to appeal in regard to a particular sentence was safeguarded to this extent, that any person could appeal for leave to appeal against any sentence, however small or trivial, but that if he got leave the Court of Criminal Appeal could either increase or reduce the sentence. That was relied upon as a deterrent in certain cases against these appeals. His real reason for opposing the Bill, however, was the respect in which the vital part of the Bill differed from the recommendations of any Committee that had ever sat to consider the subject. In regard to appeals on questions of fact, it left to the Court of Criminal Appeal the unrestricted right of giving leave to appeal. His main objection to this Bill was that it was absolutely unworkable. The expense, which had apparently never been estimated, would be exceedingly great, and it would be unworkable in other ways which he proposed to indicate. A person having been convicted and sentenced would apply for leave to appeal at once. For that purpose he would be entitled to come to London and put his case before the Court of Criminal Appeal. He would naturally have no counsel or solicitor, and the Court of Criminal Appeal could then assign him counsel and solicitor to fight his case for him at the expense of the country. The prisoner, therefore, would be entitled to come to London, it might be from the North of England, to appeal to this Court consisting of three, five, or seven Judges, which Court probably would have to sit all the year round to hear applications of this character. He would present the shorthand notes of the Court below, and when once that had been done the Public Prosecutor had to appear unless in the case of a private prosecution the private prosecutor was sufficiently public spirited to come forward. Let the House consider what a tremendous expense would be incurred. If they made the proceeding difficult, if everybody was not allowed to take advantage of it, or restrictions were put upon it, then it would probably operate against the newly convicted who would not know the ropes—if he might use that phrase—like old offenders. When they got before the Court of Criminal Appeal, liberty to appeal would be given or it would not. If leave was given, great expense would be incurred for no particular reason. It was upon that branch of the procedure that he ventured to prophesy a breakdown, in the first instance, of the machinery. Assuming that liberty to appeal was given, and the Court re-tried the case, it would re-try it not upon evidence, unless it was specially asked for, and not before a jury, but by three Judges sitting in London.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): Like all appeals.

MR. RAWLINSON said it was not like all appeals. There was no other appeal like this. On the contrary, if they asked for a new trial, and it was granted, the case was re-tried before another jury. That was just what did not happen under this Bill. A case would not go to a fresh jury, but it would be re-tried before three Judges, who, unless they chose to ask for witnesses, would never hear witnesses and there would be no jury to try the man at all. It was not, therefore, like other appeals; it was absolutely and intrinsically an innovation. At present, in any case tried by a jury, if the Court of Appeal found that they had come to a wrong conclusion upon a question of fact, that the verdict was against the weight of the evidence, they sent the case back to be re-tried by another jury. But the appeal now proposed was an innovation, because the re-trial would take place without witnesses, possibly without evidence, but only on such materials as were afforded by the notes of the Judge or the Chairman of Quarter Sessions, the shorthand writer's notes, and the statements of counsel who appeared before the three Judges. Was that a satisfactory mode of trial? Not only that, they apparently empowered the Court of Criminal Appeal to find any sort of verdict they chose. If it was a case of murder and it came from the Court below on the question whether or not the man charged committed the crime, the Court could find the man was guilty, or not guilty, or they could find him guilty of manslaughter, or arrive at some other of the verdicts which were set out in the Bill. Further than that, the Court could literally go to the extent of taking a defence which had never been set up by the prisoner. There was the question of insanity which had been brought before them in a recent case in America. They would really be following in the steps of the American case. A man was tried for murder and the jury convicted. The defence in the Court below was on the facts only, and in the Court of Criminal Appeal the defence on the facts was still persisted in; but under the Bill the Court could find that the man was guilty of the act, but could also find that he was insane at the time he committed it. That was a bad innovation and contrary to our criminal law at the present time. Personally, he thought it was undesirable to grant an appeal on a question of fact, but whether or not they thought it desirable, his reason for opposing the Bill was that he considered it absolutely unworkable. The Bill did not solve the problem, which he ventured to think was unsolvable. It was got up without any regard to expense. There was the expense of the transcript of the shorthand writer's notes, the expense of the Public Prosecutor appearing in every case of an application for leave to appeal, and there was the expense of providing counsel for a poor prisoner. All that had to be done in the Court of Criminal Appeal. But there was another form of expense which was not indicated in the Bill and which had not been referred to by the Attorney-General, and that was the expense of the judicial tribunal which they would have to keep up to keep pace with the work thrown upon it. Three King's Bench Judges were to be told off for the work, and they would be kept constantly employed. In the Court of Appeal and in the King's Bench Division they were blocked by arrears, and the number of Judges was not sufficient to do the work. The Attorney-General suggested that they were going to have more Judges.

SIR JOHN WALTON: I could not put it in this Bill.

MR. RAWLINSON said there was no sort of pledge that Judges were to be appointed for the purposes of the Bill. It could be easily put in the Bill that three Judges should be appointed to do this work. It was not in the Bill because they could not afford it at the present time. Already they were pressing for more Judges for the Court of Appeal and the King's Bench Division, and the need was a very urgent and real one. But they were met at every turn by the *non possumus* of the Treasury that they could not for the moment relieve the gigantic pressure on the Court of Appeal and in the King's Bench Division. If they could not do that, how could they provide the three Judges required under this Bill? He moved the rejection of the Bill because it was unworkable. If it had been confined to clauses based on the recommendation of the Beck Committee, as to appeals on points of law, it would have been a different Bill, and he would have been in favour of it, But the innovation of this measure was the liberty to ask leave to appeal on questions of fact, and the granting of leave to appeal on questions of fact. He moved, "That the Bill be read this day six months."

*MR. CLAVELL SALTER (Hants, Basingstoke) in seconding, said that although there were features in the Bill which he supported, he felt himself constrained, after giving the matter as much consideration as he could, to support the Motion of his hon. friend. It was not as though they were considering whether or not they should devise machinery for checking that great calamity, the conviction of an innocent man, because they had such machinery in existence already. With regard to sentences of undue severity and wrongful conviction, they had at the present time in the Home Office machinery which revised both sentences and convictions. The practical question for them to consider was not whether they should devise machinery for revising sentences and convictions, but whether the machinery provided by this Bill was not more costly and less efficient than the machinery they had already got for that purpose. He did not contend that the present machinery was in any way perfect, but he held that the machinery proposed under the Bill would be more costly, more cumbrous, and more dilatory, as well as less practically effective. With regard to the appeal against sentence he desired to say that the machinery proposed to be set up was unnecessarily cumbrous, and he thought the Court should be given power to dispose finally of the matter and revise or alter the sentence upon the original application for leave to appeal against the sentence and then one application might take the place of three. The Bill proposed to set up a Court of Appeal from the verdict of a jury, with, so far as he could gather, very limited powers. Sub-section 1 of Section 4 which limited the powers of the new Court of Appeal seemed to him to be the most important. He was not quite sure that he understood Section 4. Under that clause the new Court of Appeal was to be at liberty to set aside the verdict of the jury convicting a man in any case where on a civil appeal the verdict of the jury could be set aside. It then went on to say that it might set aside the judgment on very much wider grounds. He did not clearly understand what the second provision added to the powers of the Court. What was meant was that wherever a verdict could be set aside in a Civil Court it might be set aside in a Criminal Court. If that was what the section meant then this Bill gave little or nothing to the convicted man who thought his conviction was unjust. What were the grounds on which a verdict could be set aside on a civil appeal? They were that the verdict was against the weight of evidence, that was, that there had been a perverse unreasonable verdict. If they were going to wait in a criminal case until the jury had found a verdict of conviction which was perverse they would never have such a case. Juries in criminal cases, acting in the teeth of the evidence, might acquit, but they never convicted in the teeth of the evidence. There would be no such cases as that brought before the Court of Appeal. With regard to appeals on grounds of mistake, the discovery of fresh evidence and such matters, there would be few, if any, applications which would comply with the rule laid down in the Bill that they must bring forward grounds which would induce a Civil Court of Appeal to set it aside. It would not be possible in a Court of Criminal Appeal to rely upon those rules enforced by public opinion in a Civil Court of Appeal. In a Civil Court of Appeal public opinion supported the Court in being satisfied with something less than abstract justice in the Court below, but the moment they went into a Court of Criminal Appeal, and suggested to any Court that there was such a thing as a man in prison undergoing punishment and wrongfully convicted, the whole complexion of the thing would be altered in a moment, and no Court could attempt, or would be supported by public opinion in attempting, to enforce the rigid rules which limited Civil Courts. Counsel would appear and say "My client was undefended in the Court below, he is a poor man and has never been in a Court of Justice before, and he did not understand it was open to him to give evidence. He thought his wife was not an admissible witness, and other witnesses might have been called. The Court has not got to the bottom of the matter, and there is reason to fear that the conviction was unjust, and I ask for leave to appeal." That was the kind of application that would be made and whatever the House might say about the rules which governed a Civil Appeal, no Court of Criminal Appeal would reject an application of that kind if they saw even the slightest grounds to fear that an injustice might have been committed. Therefore, what would happen in practice would be that the Court of Appeal would be uneasy in view of suggestions of that kind and would proceed to deal with the matter. In what way were they to deal with this question under the Bill? He confessed that it was a little difficult to understand what they were to do. The Bill was very peremptory and provided that if they set aside the verdict of the jury they must enter a verdict of acquittal. Was it to be supposed that the Court of Appeal, merely because their confidence in the conviction had been shaken, merely because they had had some reason, not to think the man innocent but to doubt whether he was fully proved guilty, would proceed to set aside there and then the verdict of the jury and set that man free? He ventured to say that no Court would do that. There was only one way in which the Court of Criminal Appeal could act if it was to be a practical reality. It had to be satisfied *prima facie* that there was some reasonable cause to fear that there had been a miscarriage, and then, having arrived at the conclusion, the matter must be reheard and retried *de novo* upon its merits either in the Court of Appeal or in the Court from which it came. In every case where it gave leave to appeal it would have to exercise those powers which the Bill gave it of summoning witnesses and hearing the matter *de novo*. No one acquainted with these matters would suggest that the Court of Appeal would set aside the verdict of a jury on the mere investigation of documents, petitions, or shorthand notes or reports. When a case had been tried with great pains by the Judge of Assize and a jury, and after careful examination and cross-examination they had found the man guilty, was any Court of Appeal to set aside the verdict and acquit the man on the strength of a private examination of a document? Would public opinion be satisfied with that? It should not be overlooked that public opinion was not always on the side of the prisoner, and there was a public opinion which desired that justice should be done and crime properly punished. If a case, after being tried at great length, was again tried on appeal, and after examining certain documents and shorthand notes the man was released, that was not a result which would satisfy public opinion. In practice the Bill meant the continuous retrial in London of a large amount of ordinary criminal business. That was a very serious prospect and a very serious undertaking. The cost and the inconvenience involved was something which the Government and the House ought seriously to consider. How many applications were there likely to be for leave to appeal? There were some 10,000 men convicted on indictment every year in this country. How many of those were likely to ask for leave to appeal against the justice of their sentence? He believed they would almost all do so, and why should they not, because they would have every assistance under this Bill? They would have counsel. This would all tend to delay their sentence and they might possibly gain something, but they could not possibly lose anything. His belief was that the vast majority of prisoners convicted would ask for leave to appeal against their sentence. When a man was convicted under this Bill he was to be treated for the first ten days as a person under detention. His friends and solicitor would have access to him, and it would be very strange indeed if the solicitor was not able to find some very specious ground upon which an application could be based for leave to appeal. There would be a great number of applications, they would have to be made to the full Court, and they would be lengthy matters, because they would involve the examination of the shorthand notes in every case. There were some 200 working days in the year, and if half the prisoners convicted applied, and the Court was able to deal with as many as twenty-five cases every day—which he did not suppose they would—half of the 200 working days of the year would be so occupied. That calculation left out of account the main work of this Court in rehearing cases. They would be rehearing cases with witnesses. He did not think hon. Members realised the length of time that even an ordinary case like that of a man charged with stealing three ducks would take. Such cases in the ordinary Courts took a long time and before three Judges they would take much longer. It would be said that "If you had heard the evidence you would have come to a different conclusion." That was why a Court of Appeal did not set itself up against the verdict of a jury. It merely sent down the case to be tried by another jury. That was where this Court of Appeal differed essentially from any other Court of Appeal in the country. A Court of Civil Appeal found error only. It had only to be satisfied whether a Court had gone wrong, and it was not concerned with what was the right conclusion of the matter. But this Court of Appeal would be called upon to do this. He asked the House to imagine the expense and inconvenience of the proposed Court. It would have to send for witnesses from all parts of the country under the powers given by this Bill, it would have to question them and try to get at the bottom of the case and the real truth of the matter. There were, he thought, considerations graver even than those of expense and inconvenience to many people. With 10,000 convictions in a year the number of persons who had the misfortune to be summoned as witnesses was very large indeed. They were already put to great expense and inconvenience in going to Petty Sessions and Assizes—going first before the Grand Jury and then before the Petty Jury—and it would be a hardship if they had to come to London and go through the matter again in a Court of Appeal. But there were worse mischiefs which might arise. He had spent the best part of his life in the presence of juries, and no small part of it in the presence of criminal juries. He thought there were few things finer in this country than the demeanour of a jury in any serious criminal case. That was, he believed, mainly because they felt that the life or the liberty of a fellow creature was put into their hands to dispose of finally. If this Bill passed what would be the effect upon jurymen? What happened now? He instanced the ordinary doubtful case. The jury had been charged that if the matter was one merely of grave suspicion, they must acquit; and that if it amounted to practical certainty they must convict. They retired, and some of them would be for conviction, while others would think that the case did not go beyond grave suspicion. In nine cases out of ten prudence and caution would prevail, and the party for acquittal would triumph. How would juries deal with a case like that if this Bill were enforced? The Bill gave an appeal to one side. The appeal in civil cases was upon both sides. It would be said that if the jury wrongfully convicted the prisoner could appeal. He felt, as had been said by great lawyers in another place, that to set up a permanent Court of Appeal and invite the reconsideration of the verdicts of juries in criminal cases, would be to destroy finally that deep feeling of conscientiousness which was the great glory of our Criminal Courts, and the great safeguard of persons who were accused. He had heard a great Judge say that the common expression "the benefit of the doubt" was an odious phrase. In a sense it was odious, but it was a convenient phrase. If there was set up a Court of Criminal Appeal it was exactly the "benefit of the doubt" which the accused would in practice lose. If the House was going to pass the Bill, he urged the Government to consider carefully whether they ought not to give to the Court of Criminal Appeal the option, at their discretion, to order a re-hearing or re-trial, or whatever the proper expression might be. The case would then be sent down to the Assizes of the county in which it occurred. He would not suggest the sending of it down again to Quarter Sessions. Considering the enormous expense to witnesses, he thought there would be every ground for sending the matter down to be retried in the country. That would mean an immense saving to the Court of Appeal, and no appreciable addition to the work of the Assizes. On the whole he viewed with alarm this proposal to set up a Court of Criminal Appeal. How many cases would there be in which this costly machine would operate to sift out cases of admitted injustice? No one doubted that in the Courts, not being infallible, the occasional calamity did occur of unjust conviction. This Court of Appeal would work at great expense and inconvenience to discover in the course of the year very few cases in which men had been unjustly convicted. The Home Office in doing this work now investigated these matters, and he had never heard any experienced man suggest that the Department did not do its work in the most admirable fashion. The Home Office was not restricted in its methods as the Court of Appeal would be. It was not limited by rules of evidence, and he thought it was a fact that in the majority of the very few cases in which the Home Office did trace out a miscarriage of justice it did so, not on any material placed before it by the prisoner or his friends, but on independent inquiry conducted on its own lines. He thought there were cases in which the Home Office had found that there had been miscarriage of justice where a Court of Appeal would not have interfered with the conviction. To substitute this most costly machinery for the present system would deprive our Criminal Courts of their principal glory in the deep sense of care, caution, and responsibility which was pervading the atmosphere of every Criminal Court in the country at the present time. He begged to second.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months."—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he did not rise to support the Amendment or to discuss the merits of the Bill. Nobody who had listened to his hon. and learned friend could have a doubt as to the enormous importance of the issue raised, and he rose to put before the Government the inconvenience of attempting at such a time a discussion of a Bill proposing such a great change in the criminal jurisprudence of the country. He had no charge to make against the Government of breach of faith; he did not even suggest that they had gone contrary to Parliamentary traditions; but the fact remained that some of those most capable of taking part in the discussion were absent because of a natural miscalculation. The Bill had come on unexpectedly, and the fact that there had been a miscalculation was evident from the fact that the Attorney-General was not in his place when the order was called. He did not think the Government would gain anything in economy of time by pressing on a discussion which would have to be interrupted at a quarter-past eight o'clock. Let the Government look at the benches behind them and note the absence of legal talent so often to be seen there. The Bill for the first time would introduce into criminal jurisprudence the power of Judges, in the absence of a jury, to decide on questions of criminality. It would be an entire change in what had hitherto been essential, and he did not think the Bill should be taken in an hour and a half accidentally and unexpectedly available through the drying up of the flow of eloquence upon the Butter Bill. He moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." (*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

SIR JOHN WALTON said he recognised the force of the right hon. Gentleman's remarks, and had no objection to his Motion. But, having regard to the considerable amount of business before the House, he hoped when the Bill came on again the debate would not be prolonged.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would exercise any influence he possessed to prevent any discussion of the Bill being used to obstruct other business.

MR. S. T. EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said that this Bill was of a very important character, and he hoped that opportunity would be given to discuss it very fully. Its subject matter had been in the mind of law reformers for more than a generation, and a similar Bill was passed by the House of Lords last year. It had been said that when they came to discuss the details of the Bill, legal practitioners would have to say a good deal about them. But what about legal performers? Lord Eldon, who was a great lawyer, approved of capital punishment for the theft of articles of the value of 5s. The Bill ought to be discussed in a larger way in the interests of the public, and every effort should be made by the Government to pass it into law this session.

Question put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.

---

## PROBATION OF OFFENDERS (NO. 2) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland), in moving the Second Reading, said the Bill was of a non-controversial character, and the Government had not heard a whisper of opposition to it from any quarter in the House. Its purpose was to enable Courts of Justice to appoint probation officers, and pay them salaries or fees, so that certain offenders whom the Court did not think fit to imprison, on account of their age, character, or antecedents might be placed on probation under the supervision of these officers, whose duty it would be to guide, admonish, and befriend them. Under the Bill the various Courts of Justice would have complete freedom of choice as to the officers they would appoint, and he hoped that with this latitude in a few years experience would show what class of men, or of women, should best be placed in charge of these cases. The Bill embodied the provisions of the First Offenders Act, it was desired by reformers of our penal system throughout the country, and he trusted that the House would give it a Second Reading, leaving the discussion of details to the Committee. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said that so far as this Bill re-enacted some of the provisions of the First Offenders Act, he had nothing to say against it; but on reading the Bill he found it difficult to understand exactly what the powers and duties of the probation officers would be. Supposing an offender on probation went about the country in search of employment, would it be the duty of the officer under whose supervision he had been placed to follow him up in order to see how he behaved or could the officer go into a probationer's house without permission? He ventured to say that the Bill as it stood was only a skeleton, but he hoped that in Committee it would be moulded into a practical shape, and that the duties of the probation officers would be more exactly defined. He knew of very many cases where the assistance of the Police Court Missionaries had been the saving of prisoners released under the First Offenders Act; and he wanted an assurance that there would be no objection to the appointment of such missionaries to the position of probation officers.

*MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said that the Bill had come forward somewhat unexpectedly, and the Under-Secretary for the Home Office had done his best to explain it briefly. But the measure was one of great complexity, and would have to be carefully considered in Committee. He quite agreed that a great deal might be done in making the lot of first offenders easier and more humane than it now was. But a great deal depended upon the method. The hon. Gentleman had suggested that the duty of the probation officers was to guide, admonish, and befriend first offenders. That was a point which would require very careful consideration in connection with men who in search of work had gone away from where their offence had been committed. One of the objections to the present administration of the criminal law was that a ticket of-leave man, honestly desirous of reforming his life, had frequently to report himself to the nearest police station. that militated against him by making his conviction known. In the same manner much harm might be done to a young offender under this Bill if he were pursued about the country by a probation officer, anxious to guide, admonish, watch, and befriend him, and he would remind the Under-Secretary that Section 3 provided that a probation officer might be a police constable. He asked the hon. Gentleman to recognise some of the difficulties which might occur, and possibly at the end of Clause 1 some words should be inserted to insure that these persons charged with the supervision of probationers should be carefully selected for the delicate duties they would have to perform. In the case of girls and young children, women should be employed, and in the case of those probationers whose mental condition was such that it was considered expedient to release them, such persons only should be employed to supervise them whose training and experience fitted them to cope with mental cases. He did not make these few cursory remarks in any hostile spirit, and he was sure that the Government would afford an adequate opportunity for discussing the details of the Bill in Committee.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said the Bill would be welcomed by a large body of public opinion in the country. This system of probation had been for many years in active operation in the United States, especially in Massachusetts, and in some of our Colonies, and he believed it had had excellent results. In our own country also the principle of the Bill had been already to some extent carried out, because the Court missionaries had largely performed the duties which it was the object of the Bill to regularise. Whatever might be the effect of the system on adults, there could be no doubt that it would have a salutary effect in the case of children.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) wished to reinforce to some extent the doubts as to what were to be the duties and, still more important, the obligations of this entirely new class of persons they were going to create under the name of probation officers. The Bill created, by using a new word, a new *status pupillaris*. The intentions of the Bill were undoubtedly excellent and of the very best kind, but hon. Members were not doing their duty if they did not draw attention to the fact that the Bill in general terms relegated probationers to what was called the supervision of the probation officers. What deduction was to be made from the liberty of the person who was placed under the control of a probation officer? A new kind of *quasi* criminal relation was being created by the measure. Would the probation officers have the right of entry into a person's house, and if not why not? Was the officer to have the right of following a person about the country? Such questions as these must necessarily occur to persons when they saw a new kind of legal relationship being created. He did not attach much importance to figures for Massachusetts, because no one would deny that in this country there had always rightly been greater solicitude about the liberty of the subject than was the case in other countries. He wished very well to the intention of the Bill, but it was only right that attention should be drawn to the imperfect way in which some of its provisions had been drawn up.

MR. MACLEAN (Bath) wished to give his hearty support to the Bill. As one who had had sixteen or seventeen years experience in connection with the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children he said that whatever its effect as to adults might be, nothing but good could arise from the probation officers undertaking the charge of children who had come before the Court, for they came from homes which would be all the better for being looked after. He regretted that there was no provision in the Bill making compulsory the holding of children's Courts.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) thought that it was a mistake to suppose that this Bill would be useful only in the case of children. The probation officers would be very useful in a large number of cases, such as habitual drunkenness, with which the Courts were unable to deal in a remedial sense. It must be remembered that the persons who came under the control of the probation officers would already have become liable to imprisonment or other punishment. He hoped that by tact and judgment the probation officers would be able to rescue these persons, which was a great deal more important than punishing them. There was a demand for this Bill among social reformers in the country.

MR. RAWLINSON said that the Bill really introduced nothing new except the creation of the probation officer. Clause 1 merely re-enacted the power which already existed of binding a prisoner over in his own recognisances to come up for judgment when called upon. Any of the Members of the House who had sat as magistrates or recorders knew that that was a very common form indeed, and the power had been used in the country for years. The only new point being the appointment of probation officers, he wished to know what their powers ought to be. First offenders were also dealt with most kindly and considerately under the provisions of the law. Before he assented to a new class of officials he would like to know what their powers were to be. It was a common thing to tell a man that if he did not get into trouble again he would hear no more of the case, but would this probation officer have the power to follow a man and be something in the nature of a police officer? He had no particular objection to the Bill if it was merely a benevolent measure to provide and pay somebody like the Court missionary, with no legal powers, to look after the offender. If that was all it was an excellent Bill and he should not think of opposing it.

*MR. HERBERT SAMUEL said the Government certainly could not plead guilty to vagueness. He pointed out that Clause 1, subsection (4), explicitly said the Court might order the offender to be—

> "Under the supervision of such person as may be named in the order during the period specified in the order, and such other conditions for securing such supervision as may be specified in the order."

That was the nature of the powers the Government proposed to give, and as to the "other conditions" they considered that details of that nature had better be determined by regulations or rules of Court. If hon. Members opposite proposed in Committee Amendments to make the terms more explicit, his right hon. friend would no doubt consider them. In reply to the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University, he would point out that Clause 3 gave ample powers to the Court to secure that the offender should obey the order under which he was placed. There were full powers, if the offender failed to observe any of the conditions of his recognisance, to summon him to the Court, and, if necessary, to commit him to prison. No doubt the Bill created an interference with the person's liberty, but it was intended to be an alternative to imprisonment. It was a milder form of punishment than imprisonment. The probation officer was not intended to be a person in uniform like a police officer. It was better for an offender to submit to this supervision than to undergo imprisonment.

**Mr. S. T. EVANS** considered the Bill a short step in the right direction. Its main object was to give Judges and magistrates power, where the offence required something more than a mere binding over, to decide whether the person should be sent to prison or whether some milder punishment might be imposed. It was quite certain that a reform of this kind was remedial in its character. It was not to punish more but to impose a mild form of penalty so that the offender might not go into the category of gaol-birds.

**Mr. CROOKS** (Woolwich) thought the Bill provided a remedy against offenders slipping back into their old environment and amongst old temptations. If there were somebody just to lay a hand on their shoulder and say, "My friend, unless you behave yourself, I shall feel obliged to return you to a place where you do not want to go," that would often suffice to save them from yielding to temptation. He had known many cases of failure due to persons of this character having slipped back to their old environments; they had finished up with long terms of imprisonment, and one case ended in capital punishment being inflicted.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*

## PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to examine the publications printed by order of this House or presented to it through Public Departments, and to call attention to any case in which unnecessary expense has been incurred.

Mr. Cleland, Mr. Harold Cox, Mr. Crombie, Mr. William Jones, Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh, Mr. Maddison, Mr. Compton Rickett, Mr. George Roberts, and Mr. Toulmin nominated Members of the Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the Quorum. —(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Public business having been concluded at ten minutes past Eight o'clock, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until a quarter past Eight o'clock.

---

## RURAL DEPOPULATION.

**Mr. ROGERS** (Wiltshire, Devizes) rose to call attention to the subject of rural depopulation, and to move—"That the progressive decline of population in rural districts is a subject of serious national concern, and that this House ought at once to take such action, legislative and administrative, as will maintain a rural population as a reservoir of national strength and a necessary condition of national well-being." It was, he said, only owing to his deep sense of the importance of the subject that he brought it forward so soon after the notable declaration of policy by the Prime Minister on this subject. The importance of the problem, not only to rural districts, but to the towns, must be his excuse for submitting this Resolution. He had been a resident in a purely rural district for the last fourteen years, and he had come to the conclusion that there was no other matter which so deeply and so vitally affected the welfare of the rural democracy as this question of the depopulation of the land. The facts of the rural exodus were fairly well known, but the House, he hoped, would pardon him if he gave a few figures which would enable them to realise the real gravity of the case. In the year 1881 there were 983,919 labourers on the land in Great Britain; in 1891, there were 866,543; and in 1901, there were 689,292, showing a decrease since 1881 of 30 per cent. or nearly 300,000. But they had to add the other persons who were employed in connection with agriculture, and when they took into account one or two classes they would find that whereas in 1881 there were 1,319,000 person engaged in agriculture in various ways, in 1901 the number was just over a round million. But this did not represent the true facts of the case, because the return only gave the number of people actually employed on the land, and they had to add dependents, women and children, and workers in village occupations which were dependent on agriculture, as, for instance, the village blacksmith, the carpenter, and others. It was probably no exaggeration to say that there was something like a million less people living on the land to-day than there were twenty years ago. This was a very unsatisfactory and serious state of things. It meant that we had a million less persons on the land from whose labour could be produced that portion of our food supply which could be grown at home. The causes of this exodus from the rural districts were various. The dulness of village life, the migratory instinct of the young men to leave the village for the towns or the Colonies, the attractions of the towns, were all causes which led to the decrease of the rural population. But the main cause of it he believed to be an economic one. They often heard it said that the conversion of arable land into grass land had had a considerable effect. He believed, however, that the effect of this had been greatly exaggerated. It was a notable fact, and hon. Members would find reference to it in the report of the Board of Agriculture on the state of the rural population, that in Scotland during the thirty years up to 1901 arable land hardly decreased at all compared with grass land; there was hardly any conversion into pasture during those thirty years. But later on there was the same exodus of labourers as in England. He thought that showed, along with other things into which he would not go, that it was not merely a question of turning arable land into grass land, but that there were other causes at work to account for the exodus. One of these was the extended use in agriculture of labour-saving machinery. This was particularly to be noted among the large farmers of the country in the south and west and centre of England, where machinery has been used to a very large extent for the last twenty-five years, and it was in those parts where the largest amount of depopulation had taken place. He instanced the case of his own village, only eighty miles from London. Ten years ago a farmer in that village employed nine or ten men, and they were paid wages which amounted in the year to £420. That farm was now consolidated with others; that was to say, it had been added to neighbouring farms, which were all joined together as one large holding. On this farm there were to-day employed no regular hands; all the labour was done by a gang of workers who moved about from farm to farm, with the natural result that cottages were uninhabited, and one did not need to go any further to seek the reason of the depopulation in that particular neighbourhood. On a second farm belonging to the same owner there were eight men less than were employed some years ago, and on a third farm there were six men less. The whole of the holdings were turned into a large sheep and cattle run, more like the primitive or colonial type of farm than the highly cultivated farm which they would expect to find within eighty miles of London. This consolidation of farms, probably more than anything else, combined with the use of labour-saving machinery, had brought about the decrease of the country population. In the particular parish of which he was speaking the population had dropped by 18 per cent., and of course it was not only the people who left the village who suffered, but those who remained in it also suffered, such as the small village tradesman, and all those who were dependent on the presence of a population for their means of livelihood. This consolidation of farms had produced a state of things which was deservedly unpopular—he referred to the extension of the system known as the tied-cottage system, which meant that a man took his house as part payment of wages. If he lost his job on the farm he lost not only his wages but his home; and it meant that he could not get work without moving from his native village and leaving all his friends. Nothing destroyed a man's sense of independence more quickly than the knowledge that he was possibly living only for a short time in his cottage; he had no interest in his garden, and very little in his home. Again, this system of tied cottages led to the cottages being kept in a bad state of repair. The farmer was often only the middle man in regard to repairs, and he might not be sorry to have the opportunity to lord it over his labourer by refusing to do the repairs. Another fact was that it was the young men who left the country villages for the towns. They usually came to a town with some position already secured, and they performed, looking at it from the national point of view, a highly useful service. in repairing the wastage caused by town life. In a memorandum by Mr. Wilson Fox, appended to the Report of the Departmental Committee on Agricultural Settlements in British Colonies, it was shown, as the result of a large number of investigations, that the following were the facts—

> "Out of nearly 10,000 men out of work or in irregular casual employment as found in Salvation and Church Army Homes and Shelters, and in Rowton Houses, by the distress committees formed under the Unemployed Workmen's Act, 1905, and amongst dock labourers, the percentage of town-bred men ranged from 86 per cent. to 94 per cent., the percentage of country-bred men being only from 6 per cent. to 14 per cent."

The Report went on to say—

> "But perhaps the most conclusive evidence is afforded by the relatively large proportion of country-bred men employed in a selected number of the larger undertakings and industries, such as the post office, police, municipal service, railways, gas works, breweries, stores, etc. Of the total number so employed in London in these selected industries, early in 1906, 46 per cent. were country born."

He contended that the statement showed that the towns were very largely dependent upon the existence in rural parishes of a population which could repair the wastage of the towns. There was an interesting passage on this question in the Report of the Physical Deterioration Committee—

> There cannot, however, be any controversy as to the expediency of arresting, where possible, the exodus to which such baneful results are attributed. Nothing, perhaps, would be so likely to force upon the urban communities the necessity of healing their own sores, and bringing up a healthy population within their own limits, as the cessation of the influx of vigorous bodies to take the place of the crushed and broken by the wheel of city life."

*Mr. Rogers.*

Even if too gloomy a view of a portion of London was taken in those extracts the evidence tended to show that the problem affected the town as well as the country. If this depopulation continued at the same rate as in the past, not only would the country districts suffer, but the national physique was in danger of being permanently impaired. With regard to suggested remedies he did not think the artificial raising of the prices of agricultural produce by fiscal reform would be any remedy at all. A tariff of 2s. per quarter on foreign wheat would scarcely raise the price, and a small rise in prices would not have the effect of bringing more land into cultivation, because no farmer in his senses would think of increasing his area of corn cultivation with a tariff of 2s. per quarter. If he was right in his contention that machinery had been a very important factor in the matter, surely no hon. Member would think of setting back the clock in order to bring back the population to the country. In the next place, if they were to adopt a tariff to raise prices high enough to induce farmers to devote a larger area to the production of corn, that would be a great injustice to the large populations in the towns, because it would be a hardship upon the consumer. It was preposterous to suppose that the 40,000,000 people engaged in industry would ever consent to any considerable sacrifice in order to secure a very doubtful advantage for the 1,000,000 people who lived in the country. If no rise in price was produced no advantage would be gained by the home producer. He did not think they could by fiscal reform give any advantage to the producer of home food stuffs unless they raised the price. He would like to quote as a witness on this point the Leader of the Opposition, who spoke with admirable clearness on this question in a speech delivered on the 4th of October, 1904, in Edinburgh, in which he said—

> "A protective policy, as I understand it, is a policy which aims at supporting or creating home industries by raising home prices. The raising of prices is a necessary step towards the encouragement of an industry under a protective system. The means by which it attains that object is by the manipulation of a fiscal system to raise home prices. If the home prices are not raised the industry is not encouraged. If the industry is encouraged it is by the raising of prices."

In the face of that statement he thought he was entitled to say that the only possible way by which they could give any advantage to agriculture would be by the raising of home prices, which would be a state of things resented by a large majority of the population in the towns. If the exodus to the towns was caused largely by machinery, it could only be checked by encouraging that type of farming where machinery was least used. That might possibly sound an uneconomic proceeding. They often talked of farmers as if they were all one kind of farmers, but they were nothing of the sort. There were different types of farmers, as distinct in the kind of things they produced and the way they produced them as manufacturers engaged in other industries. Although machinery was in use on large farms there were a number of things done on small farms upon which machinery could not be used. No machinery had yet been invented for breeding or fattening pigs and poultry, or for raising fruit, vegetables, or flowers. All those things depended upon individual attention and care, and they were not articles that could be produced under a system of large production, because they depended for their success upon the individual attention of the man interested and concerned in their successful production. The encouragement of this kind of small holdings and small farms was economic, because the question of labour-saving machinery did not come in, and where machinery was required it could best be employed upon a co-operative basis. In this country two-thirds of the occupiers of land held fifty acres or less, but they only covered 15 per cent. of the total cultivable land. The problem, therefore, was how could they by State action of any kind so increase the proportion of small farmers as to make that 15 per cent. a very much larger proportion of the cultivable land of England? During the last fourteen years the value of the imports of butter, bacon, eggs, poultry, and cheese—the articles produced on the smaller farms—had increased from £27,000,000 to £48,000,000, and that increase of 80 per cent. had not been accompanied by a fall in price, indeed in many respects the prices were higher. With the assistance of a system of co-operation, there was no reason why the English market should not be recaptured by the home producer of those articles. Lately there had been some correspondence in the London Press as to the demand for small holdings. He noticed that right hon. Gentlemen and hon. Members who had contributed to that discussion had called the correspondents of the Board of Agriculture to their assistance. The evidence of those correspondents was very largely biassed by the particular notions they held, and as they were known to be by no means friendly to a system of the sub-division of holdings, he did not attach so much importance to their evidence as to the fact that small farms and small holdings were always let at a higher rent per acre than big farms. If they wanted evidence of the reality of the demand for small farms and small holdings, it was to be found in the fact that the small holders and small farmers were now paying a much higher price for land than the large farmer, and they were prepared to pay the higher rent because they could make a good thing out of it by producing a variety of articles. He would like to give an example or two to the House. In the first place he would take an estate in Wiltshire belonging to the Crown. In one parish, out of 6,645 acres there were 6,575 acres let in large farms. After eliminating the buildings altogether so as to get rid of the most disturbing factor in the comparison, and taking the average gross estimated rental of those acres, he found that it worked out at 7s. 1d. per acre. Taking in the same parish the seventy acres let as small holdings, small farms and allotments, he found, eliminating the buildings, that the average gross estimated rental was £1 17s. 8d. per acre, or about five times as much as the rental of the large farms. Taking another parish only about four miles away from the one he had just dealt with, where the soil was different, and where there was a different type of cultivation, he found that out of 1,488 acres 1,250 were let as large farms at a gross estimated rental of 6s. 5d. per acre. The remaining 238 acres let in small holdings and allotments produced a rental of £1 14s. 1d. per acre, or more than five times the rent of the land let in large farms. He knew too much about this problem, however, to allow himself to be led away altogether by facts like those. He knew that land let for small holdings was possibly of superior quality; but the discrepancy was too great to be explained away except on the assumption that there was a much greater demand for small holdings than for large farms. He would like for a moment to refer to experiments which had been made by various persons in this country. A good deal of pioneer work had been done by landlords in different parts of the country, and he thought the State should realise that it was time for it to step in and do on a large scale what individuals had been trying to do on a small scale, in order to bring about a very much better state of things than could be produced otherwise. Possibly some Members of the House had seen the interesting experiment which had been tried at Winterslow by a Wiltshire landlord named Major Poore. That was a place which, if it had not been taken in hand by one gentleman who knew the subject, might have been described as land which, whatever might be done with it, could not be successfully farmed. It had a cold and unlikely soil, and a poor supply of water. The experiment was started on 112 acres, on which there were living one farmer and three labourers. At the present time there were forty-seven tenants in occupation of the land as freeholders. He should say that there were 157 men, women, and children altogether, but what was perhaps more important and striking than all was that they had built thirty-seven houses as the result of their occupation of the land. He contended that the Government might well bring forward legislation with the object of multiplying colonies of that kind. He was very glad in this connection to record his gratitude to Lord Carrington for what he had done in the administration of Crown lands. No doubt many hon. Members were aware of a case in Cambridgeshire where a big farm had been sub-divided and let to eighty-two tenants who were now in occupation of the land. It was a noticeable feature in this case that these men already had buildings, and that therefore the amount to be spent on buildings was not large considering the size of the holdings. There was another case of Crown lands at Bromham where a farm of 240 acres was farmed by one farmer, who gave employment to three or four men. There were now sixty-four tenants, among whom were a number of young men who were taking allotments of one or two acres, and who from that would go on until in the end they became small freeholders. That was, to his mind, an illustration of what could be done in connection with the rural life of the country. He had given to the House some of the reasons why it seemed to him in this matter that they need not despair of reform. It was not in his opinion a hopeless problem. There were hon. Members on the Opposition Benches who might argue that this could not be an agricultural country. He must totally disagree with them. The very existence of large industrial populations implied that there were markets for our produce. When we had the enormous urban populations in and around London, in Lancashire, in Yorkshire, and in other parts of the country, we had at any rate very large and very good markets which we could supply and which, he believed, we would supply one day to a very considerable extent by the produce of our own people. But we could not do it as long as we had only a million people to do the work in the country districts, and as long as there was land in the country let to such a large extent in big farms and to an increasing extent, as it seemed to him, in farms which were rapidly being consolidated and added together one after another. The Government having put their hand to the plough had expressed their intention not to turn back. He could only hope that having put their hand to the plough they would plough their furrow straight and plough it soon. He begged to move.

*MR. WALKER (Leicestershire, Melton), in seconding the Motion, said it was essentially a workers' problem, and could not engage too much of their time and attention. Agriculture was essentially the problem which bore on the question of depopulation. In the Report on Agricultural Depopulation, it was made perfectly clear that the decrease in the population had been entirely owing to the decrease in agricultural labourers. While farm labourers had decreased, bailiffs and shepherds had actually increased by 10,000 in the last ten years. Therefore this was a terrible workers' question in the country districts. While there had been a decline in the number of labourers in the last twenty years from 984,000 to 689,000, the decline in the amount of arable land had been 2,000,000 acres, or a drop from 17,500,000 to 15,500,000 acres. If they made a simple calculation they found a percentage drop of thirty in the population and a percentage drop of only 11½ in the acreage of arable land. That proved conclusively that the laying of the land down to grass was not the main cause of depopulation in the rural districts. If they put on a duty which would delight the heart of Mr. Chaplin, they would not do much to restore the agricultural population. Labour-saving machinery was the main cause of the decline, and according to the Report of the Committee the adoption of labour-saving machinery had been greater on arable land than on land laid down to grass. The fact was that agriculture, though later in the day, had been subject to the same tendency as the manufacturing industries. But machinery had come to stay, and it was no good trying to get rid of it. It was true that, whereas twenty years ago labour-saving machinery was employed by comparatively few, it had now become almost universal on all holdings of sufficient size to make its use practicable. He found in the Report that in dairy farming the decrease in population was not so great as in other cases, and they had encouraging reports from Lincolnshire and elsewhere where fruit and vegetables had been grown. The following statement appeared in the Report on small holdings in regard to what had been done in Holland, Lincolnshire—

> "The many small occupiers who get a living in growing flowers, fruit, and vegetables, have greatly, if not altogether, checked the decline."

That was a clear sign-post showing the road they ought to follow. There were other causes for the decline in rural population, such as lack of attraction and lack of incentive in the country districts. It might also be admitted that the advantages offered by the Canadian Government acting through their emigration agents had had a great deal to do with attracting the youth of the country by genuine offers of 160 acres of free land. If we wished to keep a hold on the youth in the country villages we must offer counter-attractions. As in our educational system we were trying by a system of scholarships to make an education ladder, so that the poor with ability might not through their poverty fail if they were able to rise to the secondary and technical schools, and even to the Universities, so we wanted diversified opportunity to enable the labourer to rise to allotments and small holdings, and thus reach an independent position. He attached very much importance to the scarcity and inadequacy of cottages in the rural districts. While in regard to small holdings there were certain differences of opinion among the correspondents of the Board of Agriculture, there was practical unanimity on the question of housing. The Report on the decline in the agricultural population contained the following—

> "Among specific causes of discontent, a deficiency of adequate or satisfactory housing accommodation is reported from about thirty counties. The details where given may be referred to, but, speaking generally, there is evidence not only—or perhaps it should be said not so much—of an actual scarcity of cottages, though this is mentioned in some cases, as of a lack of cottages which satisfy the more exigent requirements of the labourers in these times, or comply with the demands of vigilant sanitary authorities. As with every other class, the rural labourers' standard of comfort has been raised, and they are not now contented with the accommodation which previous generations placidly accepted."

Referring to the condition of things in Hampshire with respect to housing, the Report said—

> "Mr. Perkins thinks that if the number of cottages in rural Hampshire were increased by 20 per cent. during the next ten years there would scarcely be one vacant. At least half required structural alterations and additions, and 5 per cent. ought to be condemned as unfit for habitation. The difficulty is aggravated by the letting of cottages to 'week-enders,' or to people who come to reside in the country, and are willing to pay a good deal more than the labourer can afford. A further demand is created by the servants of large householders who come to reside in the country."

There was, perhaps, scarcely anyone in the House who did not know from his own experience of cases where the owners of motor cars had bought up two or three cottages and turned them into a single house, because they wished to spend the week-end in the country. There was also evidence on the same lines in the report of the Select Committee that sat on the Housing Bill of last session. The Committee pointed out that the Housing of the Working Classes Act of 1890 was primarily intended to cope with the evils in the towns and was only incidentally applicable to rural districts. They went on to say that there had been no adequate inspection of the cottages by the local sanitary authorities; and they recommended that cheaper loans should be given to landowners for building cottages and that the period of repayments should be extended. Even so, as was shown by elaborate statistics, some loss had to be borne either by the Exchequer or the rates so long as economic rent was not paid by the cottagers. It seemed to him that the present system of demanding a lower rent instead of granting an increase of wages to the agricultural labourer was a most pernicious one. It might be asked how an economic rent could be paid. It appeared to him that the most promising solution of the problem was to attach more land to the cottages, the working of which would enable the labourers to pay a remunerative rent. The Report of the Select Committee last year on the Housing of the Working Classes Acts Amendment Bill stated that—

> "There is abundant evidence to show that the difficulty of rent charge would be largely diminished by the addition of land to the cottages. The labourers and others who gave evidence before the Housing Commission of 1885 on the subject stated that the men could pay higher rent and would be pleased to do so if land, arable or pasture, were attached to their dwellings. One witness, of considerable experience, while admitting the difficulty of paying rent for good cottages alone, said it was 'easy to pay fair rent for land and cottage together.' He considered the two to be so necessary that he declined to consider them apart. The above evidence as to the great value to labourers of small plots of land to supplement their wages has been amply confirmed by the evidence received by the Committee."

When he read that paragraph he thought he saw in it a hopeful line for future action; but he confessed that he was very much disappointed to find, on reading the Report further, that the Committee did not follow out that particular idea at all. He admitted that it might be difficult to follow it out at any great length, because the system under which cottages were let at an uneconomic rent was almost universal. Still, he was sorry that the Committee did not take more evidence upon that subject, because it would have been useful to the Government when they introduced their Rural Housing Bill, which he hoped to see presented before the session was very much older. In that way he hoped it might be possible to build cottages without any or at a very small loss to the rates or to the Exchequer. He was informed by one of his Irish colleagues that no less than 4,000 cottages were to be built this year in Ireland under the Irish Labourers Act of last session, and that it was hoped that there would be little, if any, charge upon the local rates. What they had to aim at in the country districts was the greatest diversity of occupation of those who dwelt there, and the multiplication of holdings of various descriptions. From official evidence they had the encouraging fact that there were at the present time in Great Britain nearly 250,000 holdings of between five and fifty acres. No doubt a good deal of that might be land held by people who had other occupations. If that were so it did not make the thing any less valuable to them, and in desiring that small holdings should be extended in England they did not necessarily mean that everybody who had a small holding should be entirely dependent upon it for his livelihood. Were they to try to meet the demand for small holdings by legislation or simply by trusting to the ordinary forces of supply and demand? That question had been settled once and for all by the Act of 1892 which, however, had failed to achieve anything like the object which it was hoped to achieve. In the first ten years that elapsed after the Act came into existence only 652 acres were provided in the way of small holdings, and since then only 130 acres had been added. The Act had now been in operation fifteen years, and surely it was a beggarly return that less than 1,000 acres should have been provided during that time under an Act which was passed by the House in the hope that it would do a great deal of good to the agricultural industry of the country. Lord Onslow's Committee had said that this result was largely due to the apathy of the county councils. Another difficulty had been that when small holdings were required and a public inquiry had been held, the price of land at once went up. The apathy of the county councils had, he thought, led to the discouragement of agricultural labourers up and down the country. The labourer was also very often discouraged when he saw that the small holder was paying double or treble rent for land which was no better than that of the large farmer. What he would like to see was suggested in the Report of Lord Onslow's Committee, that it should be the duty of a small holdings committee of each county council to inquire every year, from the minor local authorities within the county, what land was occupied in the district by small holders; whether there was a demand for further land; and whether there was any available land. As to the question of land being sent up in price when a county council wanted to buy it, he could not dwell upon that as it would mean a new valuation law. Lord Onslow's Committee reported that they had not found that the people of this country wished to buy small holdings. They, unlike other people, would prefer to hire the land, provided they had fixity of tenure; and it was quite clear that the Act of 1892 had been a failure. He welcomed Lord Onslow's recommendation that a central department should be established under the Board of Agriculture which should act for itself, and do what it could to encourage local authorities to move in the matter. On the point of Governmental action and purchase by the Government he held very strong views, because, having travelled in Australia and New Zealand, he had seen how successfully this purchase system could be carried out. In New Zealand they passed twelve years ago a Land Settlement Act. They purchased 158 estates with an acreage of 1,000,000 acres for £5,500,000. The sites were inspected and valued with extreme care, and sometimes three independent valuations were made, the Board of Land Purchase Commissioners having discretion as to applications. What was the result? In the last financial year 4½ per cent. was returned on the total outlay by the Government. The financial difficulty so often quoted here—lack of ability on the part of those who had taken small holdings to find sufficient capital for working and cost of equipment—had also been dealt with in New Zealand. There was the Advances to Settlers Act of 1894, under which sixteen freehold and five leasehold securities had been realised with the result that in most cases a fair surplus had been realised on the amount advanced, and in no case was there an actual loss, on a total of over £5,000,000. He hoped that, experimentally at all events, something of the kind which had been attempted in New Zealand might be tried here, although he agreed that the process must be very slow unless hiring operations were undertaken at the same time. Parliamentary action was therefore advocated in two directions, directly through the Board of Agriculture, and through increased power being given to local authorities. These questions of housing and the distribution of land went to the very goal of our national well-being, and he hoped the Government would tackle them soon, and tackle them in earnest. He begged to second the Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the progressive decline of population in rural districts is a subject of serious national concern, and that this House ought at once to take such action, legislative and administrative, as will maintain a rural population as a reservoir of national strength and a necessary condition of national well-being."—(*Mr. Rogers.*)

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton) said there might be many reasons for the failure of the Act of right 1892, but no one who had heard his hon. friend the Member for the Bordesley Division describing the great success which had attended it in one part of Worcestershire where it had been put fairly in force, could doubt but that there had been considerable unwillingness on the part of the county councils to do what they had been invited to do, and practically engage on a large scale in land speculation. But there were also other forces which had interfered with the Act being put into force—namely, the nature of the advances, and the practically prohibitive terms on which they had to be made. The right hon. Member for Bordesley, he was glad to see, had brought in a Bill to amend the Act and to bring it into operation, but it had been blocked night after night apparently in order that His Majesty's Government should bring in a larger scheme of their own. He sympathised with the object of the Motion. The magic of property and the desire to obtain it were very great. People in this country would like to have some of the facilities for acquisition which were provided for their fellow-citizens across

St. George's Channel, and if they had, there would be a very great change for the better in rural England. He hoped we should see to an increasing extent the labourer becoming the owner of his own land.

MR. BLACK (Bedfordshire, Biggleswade) declared that the real solution of the problem lay in the wages question. Nowadays young men were better educated than their fathers had been, and they refused to be content with the dreary life of ill-requited toil, with no prospect but the workhouse for their latter days. Only three weeks ago from the small Bedfordshire village of Lidlington five young men went out to Canada, and the country which had bred and fed and reared them had lost their services, while Canada had gained. Nowadays the average labourer earned only 14s. 6d. per week, and that was not a living wage. Farm rents during this time were increasing, while wages of labourers were almost stationary. We were putting the landowner first, the farmer second, and the labourer third; but that order ought to be reversed. He would like to see a minimum wage established for these labourers at not less than £1 a week. If the labourer were better paid he would be worth more, and until he was better paid the problem of rural depopulation would never be solved. In the long run the farmer could get no more out of the workers than their pay. It was the same with cattle and horses. They only got as much out as they put in. It was true the labourer got a cheap cottage, but that was part of the plan to deprive him of his just earnings. On many estates cottages formed part of the furniture of the estate. A cottage costing £150 or £200 could not be provided for 1s. or 1s. 6d. a week rent. As a matter of fact, in many cases a sufficient number of these cottages were not provided. But if the labourer were paid a fair wage he could pay for a better cottage. The agricultural labourer had never had a fair chance of getting a fair day's wage for a fair day's work, and of providing the necessities and a few of the comforts of life for wife and family. This proposal he believed would enable the labourers to become generally better customers for commodities, and in that way it would react beneficially over the whole industrial life of the country.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, E.) thought that to whatever section of the House hon. Members belonged they must be in entire sympathy with this Resolution and the spirit and manner in which it had been moved and seconded. Opinions might differ as to the means by which the Resolution was to be carried out; but there was no doubt that the desertion of our villages and hamlets must have an unwholesome, if not a disastrous, effect on our national life. These people went from the pure air in the country to the stifling slums of the great cities, and that must, and undoubtedly did have, an evil effect on the character and physique of the people. When they came to contemplate the remedy for this state of things they were told about the burden of life in the villages, but they were not told how that state of things was to be remedied. He entirely agreed with what had been said about doing something more, and he had always worked loyally with his colleagues in Ulster so far as facilitating the building of cottages and the acquisition of allotments were concerned. The only remedy in his opinion was the fiscal remedy. We boasted of being a free trade country, a position we shared with only one country in the world—China; yet our customs taxation imposed by the Government was 12s. 2d. per head of the population. The customs taxes of the United States were 11s. 8d., and those of the so-called protectionist country—our great trade rival, Germany—were only 8s. 2d. We had no right therefore to claim that we were a free trade country. We were protectionists to our own Empire, we taxed the tea and sugar and other products of our Empire, but in the emphatic words of the Prime Minister we slammed the door in the face of our Empire.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Prime Minister said we did not slam the door.

MR. CROOKS: We have no door to slam.

MR. T. L. CORBETT said that during the last few weeks the Colonies felt that we had slammed the door. But he for one would not add to the cost of living in any way, knowing the wages of the agricultural labourer in the county he had the honour to represent, and knowing that among his supporters he had none more loyal than the agricultural labourers. Their wages did not reach the ideal of £1 a week of which they had heard, but if the scheme of tariff reform were carried out they would rise to that ideal. He would endeavour by such means to cheapen the cost of luxuries and necessities such as tea, sugar, and tobacco, and he believed that such a reform would also raise wages by stimulating the great agricultural industry which, after all, must be helped and stimulated if we were to keep the population on the land at all. It was only by that means that the bone and sinew of the nation could be retained in the country—the population for whose condition no remedy had been found in this Motion.

*SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said the hon. Member was very anxious to introduce Tariff Reform and thought it would raise the wages of the labourers to £1 a week. But he thought the hon. Member would have recollected that during the time protection was in force in this country wages were at the very lowest level they ever reached. If the hon. Gentleman had studied more carefully the wages of the agricultural labourers in protectionist Germany and France, he would know that they were only two-thirds of what they were in free-trade England. He would refer the hon. Member to the evidence given before the Tariff Reform Commission, if indeed the evidence had been published as well as the Report. One of the ablest farmers in the Midlands was examined before the Tariff Reform Commission and was able from his own farm accounts of many years to produce figures which showed conclusively, as he assured him (Sir Francis), that if the Tariff Reform proposals of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham were in force, the result would have been that his outlay in the cost of working his farm would be so increased, that it would cost him £3 for every £2 he added to his income. These facts he was able to establish in spite of the cross-examination of Mr. Chaplin and the other members of the Commission, who were wholly unable to answer the case thus made. It was really not worth while to waste further time on such absurd delusions. This was a very serious evil, and one with which he for one had laboured to deal, and he hoped the whole House would so labour irrespective of Party or economic views. What he urged was that rural depopulation would not be remedied until a real hope was created in the agricultural population, by the agricultural industry being so organised that it was enabled to make a thoroughly good profit out of the land. Our agricultural education in the present day was quite unsuited to develop the higher energies and capacities of those engaged on the land. No cause was so potent in producing depopulation as the feeling of despair which the conditions of country life bred.

*MR. PARKER (Halifax) said the question of rural depopulation was a great deal more than an economic question; it lay at the root of our national prosperity in its best sense. He did not intend to reply at all to the remarks which had been made on the subject of tariff reform, which, with certain hon. Members, turned up like King Charles' head, no matter what might be the subject under discussion. Reference had been made to the breakdown of the Act of 1892, but one of the chief causes of that breakdown had not been mentioned, namely, that the landlord element in the county councils, an element so strongly represented, had hitherto regarded it as no part of their interest to insist on a larger number of small holders being brought on to the land. ["Oh."] He did not think that there was the slightest doubt about that, and he thought it was borne out by the evidence. He believed that only two county councils had as yet put the Act into operation. Each decade of the last fifty years had shown a continuous exodus from the country to the towns. During the ten years ended 1901 there was a reduction of the rural population by twenty per cent. There was one reason for this decrease of the population employed on the land which had not been mentioned, and that was the "make-haste-to-be rich" idea which prevailed amongst the population as a whole. It was due also to the fact that the labourer had been to school, and had had a sort of education—an education that had created a spirit of discontent that was not in all cases a righteous discontent, an education that had not been fitted to the man and given him a desire to stay where he was and get the best out of the country in which he lived. There was a strong desire among labourers for access to the land, with which desire there was little sympathy on county councils. A purchase system with increase of owners was not required, but what was required was security of tenure; an educational system fitting a man for his occupation; encouragement for such home industries as could be followed by a man and his family in winter time when work in the fields ceased. The agricultural labourer who came into the town under the impression that he would improve his position very often found out his mistake when he came to compete with the labourer in the City. When he was a boy eight years of age his father was employed on the estate of a gentleman who was once a member of the House, and who was busily engaged in trying to get into the House again. This gentleman, Mr. Chaplin, was the landlord of the particular farm on which his father was employed at a wage of 12s. or 13s. a week. But in addition to that wage, the labourer had many things added in this particular instance, such as a cottage, the garden, three tons of coal every year, a fat pig, the privilege of gleaning the fields behind the labourers, &c., and the result was the wage instead of being 12s. or 13s. was probably nearer 22s. a week. To-day the wages in that particular district were less than they were thirty-five years ago. In addition to the causes of depopulation in rural areas to which he had referred he would emphasise the fact that landlords could considerably improve existing conditions if they ceased to regard their estates as possessions which enabled them to lord it over their labourers. [Cries of "No."] Yes; he spoke from personal knowledge and experience. They must cease to lord it over them in the matters of religion, of education, of politics, and of freedom of thought and conscience. If they wanted a healthy and contented peasantry it would be necessary for Parliament to act, and to act quickly, in the best interests of the nation as a whole. He had much pleasure in supporting the Resolution.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he did not for a moment claim for himself or for those who sat around him any superior knowledge on this subject, but he thought it was a very good thing that the House of Commons should turn from high political matters in order to interest themselves in one of the most serious questions of the present day, and that they should seek calmly and dispassionately, and, if possible in the House of Commons, without Party feeling, for some remedy which would assist in the solution of the problem which lay before them. They were in search of something which would prevent the labourers from leaving their work in the country. Various remedies had been suggested, with most of which he thought they agreed. They all wanted good cottages, better wages, and employment; these were all remedies in which there was a great deal of truth, but they were not good for all cases. They might build more cottages, create more small holdings and pay higher wages, but that would not remedy the exodus of labourers from all parts of the country. The rush of the agricultural labourer to the town was really due to the spirit of the age, its restlessness and desire for amusement, and also to the force of example. Their grandfathers and great grandfathers used to drink heavily and so did the middle and lower classes. As time went on and education and knowledge spread, the upper classes drank less, and so did the middle and lower classes, and the force of example went on in that way. There ought to be a spirit of emulation in all classes. They all wished to better themselves. The agricultural labourer read of one of his own class making a fortune by coming to town, and thereupon he became dissatisfied with following the plough. The town had the same attraction for the upper classes also. An ancestor of his who had the honour of representing the City of London was content to come to town twice a year to vote, and to make perhaps two speeches in four years. Would the hon. Baronet who now sat for the City be content with a speech in two years? Would the Leader of the Opposition desire to pass his time in Scotland, wearing the kilt and tossing the caber, and only coming to the House twice a year to vote? Not a bit of it. In like manner the agricultural labourer thought the country dull, and he drifted to the town, not only to his own detriment, but to the loss of the nation. He thought that hon. Members were rather apt to forget all these things;

they appeared to imagine that there was a universal panacea which could be applied to this problem. The fact was often overlooked that in these matters the real secret of success was application and concentration.

*MR. BECK (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech) said he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, in believing that the desire for novelty characteristic of this age had much to do with rural depopulation. He, however, begged the House to remember that our present system directly assisted to drive men of enterprise from the land, whereas land reformers were desirous of doing everything possible to counteract the tendency common to all civilised nations, of agriculturists to migrate to the towns. He was sure that all parties shared in this desire, however much they might differ as to methods. For instance, they on that side had a keen appreciation of the way in which the right hon. Member for the Bordesley Division of Birmingham had kept this question before the country. After the very convincing speeches of the mover and seconder of the Resolution there was little for him to say. The part of the Resolution which he particularly supported was that contained in the two words "at once." Nobody would deny that time and again the people in the rural districts had had held out to them on this subject hopes which had not been realised. They hoped the Government would grasp this nettle firmly, and introduce legislation on practical lines. He was aware that it was no easy task, and the debate had shown the extraordinary divergence of opinion in regard to the remedies suggested. He thought, however, that the great remedy was a ladder by which the agricultural labourer could climb up into the farmer class. In the constituency which he represented there was an excellent example of what could be done when men got hold of small portions of land for themselves. The soil there was pre-eminently suitable for all kinds of what were called the smaller agricultural industries. In that particular district a most remarkable change had come over the country since men had been able to get possession of small holdings, and he wished to add his voice to those which had already been raised in favour, not of small owners, but of small tenants. He certainly granted that to a certain extent small owners had been a success, but there had been cases in which such owners had rack-rented more than any larger landlord would ever have done. Moreover, they were tied to a particular district and a particular piece of land in a way which was detrimental to their further progress. He had sincere pleasure in supporting the Resolution. No greater mistake could be made by hon. Members or by other reformers, than to suppose that the agricultural labourer was an unintelligent or stupid person. His own belief and experience was that no man was quicker to grasp opportunities than the agricultural labourer. It was the business of the House to help him, and he was sure that all, irrespective of party, were anxious to provide him with opportunities for the exercise of his energy and perseverance.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) congratulated the mover of the Motion on the courtesy and consideration which he had shown to those opposed to him in the manner in which he had brought the question before the House. He would like to make one allusion to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Halifax, who had spoken on behalf of the Labour Party. He was sorry the hon. Member had made the acquaintance of any landlord who found pleasure in attempting to dictate to his tenants in any matter of religion or politics. Such landlords were not known to him, and he doubted whether any man would make that assertion and corroborate it. Referring to the system of tied cottages, he said that on his own estate he had thought it better to break away from it, and he was rather in favour of the suggestion made by the mover of the Resolution. It was a curious fact disclosed by his own experience that a long tenure or occupation by the same man was more likely to result from the untied system. That might be a good system in one county where, perhaps, the farms were smaller, and where acquaintanceship between the owner and the occupier was more direct, but it might not hold good in another county where the conditions were different. The hon. Member must not make the mistake of arguing generally from one particular locality. If he would look at the North of England he would find that nothing would induce some people to remain in their cottages more than a year; they would insist upon going to different employers. When the hon. Member suggested that to stop rural depopulation we must go back to more primitive methods of farming, he was treading on very dangerous ground. If we went back to more primitive methods we should interfere with the system on which all our high-grade breeding of stock rested, and all that had given to this country its reputation in that direction. That would be abolished. It was by practising the highest scientific farming, and by using the best possible implements, that we had been enabled to maintain our great reputation as a farming country. The hon. Member must bear that in mind when he argued for the original type of farming as being most likely to check rural depopulation. The hon. Member had referred to the cost of buildings, but he himself thought that what was said on that question would, from the economic point of view, break down if subjected to examination. The hon. Member had said that there was a great demand for small holdings, but had he considered how limited the capital of agricultural labourers was who had to enter upon a holding of from three up to ten acres? He had no capital to risk in building, and often his sole capital was the promise of a loan from somebody. Then it must be remembered that a man who did not bring capital into a holding was naturally more willing to take risks in cultivation than a man with capital. The hon. Member had made a remark touching on the delicate subject of the possible effects of a duty on corn. The last thing why a man should support tariff reform was the idea that he was going to get an increased profit on his corn. It might give him advantages in other ways, but not an increased price for his corn. The hon. Member had also referred to emigration as the cause of rural depopulation, and there he was in close agreement with hon. Members on both sides of the House. But how were they going to check emigration? He maintained that they might check it by making the conditions of life on the land in this country such as would make labourers and small holders prosperous and comfortable even in their old age. Another question raised was the insufficiency of the supply of cottages for agricultural labourers. He would like to see a wider knowledge and appreciation of the really splendid efforts which were being made by landlords all over England in the direction of the provision of fine cottages for their farm hands. Full credit should be given to those landlords who were trying to provide cottages which involved a direct heavy loss upon them. He knew from personal experience that a pair of cottages in his own county cost not less than £400, and they were let at £4 a year each, which was less than it cost to keep them up. He agreed with the hon. Member that wages should be based on the profits of the trades which gave employment to the workers; but he thought that £1 a week was a more accurate estimate, including incidental advantages, than 12s. or 14s. 6d. a week, of the average wages of agricultural labourers. Youngsters, as they were now brought up, had an instinctive desire for promotion; and they often fled to the towns where there seemed to be more promise of promotion open to them. He himself believed in a system of promotion. Some years ago he adopted a system by which his agricultural labourers rose steadily in position according to the number of years of their service, and since that time not a single labourer had left his service, except, of course, from accidental circumstances. Very hard references were made to the landlords in these matters, but he believed that it was more statesmanlike to encourage and stimulate them to make these experiments than to bring the State into play and to do these things by the irritating process of compulsion which seemed to recommend itself to many land reformers so that the landowners should not have the credit of doing them. Having some practical knowledge of the question, he felt competent to speak upon the subject, but it was a source of great satisfaction to himself, personally, that a great national question of this sort had been taken up in the spirit which had been manifested that evening.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): I am glad to reciprocate all that has been said by the right hon. Gentleman as to the way in which this debate has been conducted, however much we may differ as to the means of carrying out the Motion which has been moved and seconded in such an able way. Although there may be some difference, there is none as to the urgency of this question. My hon. friend the Member for Wiltshire has referred to the decline of the agricultural population, and no one has differed from his statement of the gravity of the problem, and therefore, it is the fact that wherever we sit in this House we wish to deal with the question, and to apply any possible remedies. My hon. friend explained some of the causes, and said that in the main they were of an economic character. It is not possible for me to follow him into all the details, but one point he made did strike me particularly, and that was that, as he said, one of the causes of depopulation was that of adding farm to farm. I must say that I agree with that, but it is a practice which is not so common as it was in the seventies, when it was very prevalent. At the present moment I think the tendency is, where the landlords have the opportunity, to split up large farms, but the opportunity and the power of the landlords is so limited that I think it is very desirable to aid that process of sub-dividing again farms which joined together in the last century, and to discourage the system of adding farm to farm if it has not already come to an end. Then we are told that there are other remedies. It is suggested by some hon. Members on the other side that fiscal reform would be a remedy, but I will only say that in regard to the problem of getting the labourer back to the soil and giving him some interest in the cultivation of it by allotments and small holdings, fiscal reform is certainly not the remedy. The agricultural labourer has no desire for a return of the times when labourers' wages were 7s. or 8s. a week and the price of wheat was 80s. a quarter. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Newport said that the farmer would be very foolish indeed if he advocated fiscal reform hoping to get an increased price for his wheat. On the other hand, I do not think he would be so foolish as to advocate fiscal reform which raised the price of what he bought and not what he sold. I sympathise with the idea of the hon. Member for Wiltshire that we should aim at creating a ladder for the agricultural labourer, so that a man who has done well on an allotment may rise to the position of a small farmer, and eventually have the opportunity of rising to the position of the occupier of a large farm. No doubt many Members of this House, in common with myself, have had experience of the man who began life as an agricultural labourer, and by his own industry and thrift become in middle life a substantial farmer, and in his old age able to establish his sons on farms. Our desire should be to give more of those opportunities to labourers who, by having shown thrift and ability, prove themselves worthy of being helped and of being advanced in life from small occupiers to large farmers. It is an entire mistake, however, to suppose that on this side of the House there is any desire to split up the whole country into small holdings. Nothing of the kind is desired. The whole of our desire is that there shall be holdings of every description, so as to afford opportunities of improvement in the condition of capable men. Questions of building by-laws and sanitary improvements are more for my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board and his Department than for me, but anything the House can do to promote improvement in these matters will aid in solving the problems we are considering. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Honiton Division has alluded to the unwillingness of county councils to engage in land speculation, but I do not think that in regard to small holdings there is much speculation. I think we have had sufficient proof of the success of small holdings to make the risk, if any, very slight. Men who live on the land and buy the land know perfectly well that proper care should be taken in selecting the tenants and in putting the right men on the land, and they cannot understand why the county councils should not take the same care as ordinary landlords to do the same thing; nor can I see why they should not. It has been said that there are large numbers of landlords on the county councils, and it is as necessary that they should take the same care in the selection of tenants as others do in order to make the small holdings a success. This Resolution, which deals with the decline of population in rural districts, goes on to say that it is necessary that this House should take action as regards legislation and administration. I should like to point out to the House that as regards administration a good deal has already been done since my noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture has been appointed Commissioner of Crown Lands. No sooner was he appointed than he at once facilitated the letting of land in small holdings and allotments in every way. What has been the result of his efforts? My noble friend is in absolute sympathy with the provision of small holdings and the encouragement of agricultural labourers to remain on the land and to make the best they can of it in becoming occupiers of farms. Out of fourteen counties in which there are Crown lands spontaneous applications have been made in eleven for small holdings. Take, for instance, South Lincolnshire, where eighty-seven applications have been received by my noble friend as Crown Commissioner, for 2,800 acres, and he feels that he will be able to satisfy 50 per cent. of those applications without depriving a single farmer of his home or his livelihood. It is curious, and at the same time very satisfactory, to know that the great majority of those men who made applications are already allotment holders, showing that the men who have under previous legislation got allotments are the very men who have put their foot on the first rung of the ladder, and are now proceeding higher in order that they may become small holders. I am one of those who approach this question of providing small holdings and cutting up big farms from the point of view that at the same time we must be very careful indeed that we do nothing unjust to the sitting tenant. Unless there is very good reason indeed, that man must not be interfered with, and if he is interfered with at all it must not be done in any way, as my noble friend has said, to deprive him of his own home or of his own livelihood. In the parish of Welby in Yorkshire, there are large estates of 3,600 acres, and there have been applications for 500 acres for small holdings. At the present moment of those 3,600 acres 2,000 acres are held by four farmers alone, and three of those farmers are non-resident, and do not live in the parish. I think that to have absentee landlords is undesirable, and it is also undesirable to have absentee farmers. Therefore it is no grievance to a man if he is not living in the parish, and if he is not living on his farm and does not farm it himself, that others who are anxious to farm land in the parish should have a portion of the farm of the absentee farmer. In Cambridgeshire, my hon friend the Member for Newmarket has been able in the most successful way to cut up a large farm of Crown land of over 900 acres. It had been yielding no rent at all, and was carried on, I understand, at a loss, as is too often the case with land owned by a landlord who is not on the spot to look after it himself. What has the President of the Board of Agriculture been able to do? He has been able to let it at £700 a year, to secure a profit instead of a loss for the Crown, and at the same time to split up the land into small holdings to the number of seventy-five, thus providing employment and bringing back to the land a large number of persons.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about buildings?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I have already explained to the House that a sum of about £1,800 has been provided for building, and to add to the houses already in existence. My noble friend, at an expenditure of £1,800, on which he receives interest, has been able to place seventy-five men on the land, he is getting a rent of £700 a year instead of no rent at all, and in having done all this I certainly think that he has done something well worthy of imitation. Of course we are all in agreement on this subject. Lord Onslow, the ex-President of the Board of Agriculture, when he was in office referred to this very question of small holdings. He said he would be very glad to introduce a measure to facilitate the provision of small holdings and the division of large holdings into smaller holdings, but that he did not feel justified in drafting a Bill that had no chance of becoming law. I can assure the House that we have the same feeling as to the necessity of introducing a measure for small holdings and the division of larger holdings into smaller holdings. But we do not say that there is no time to do it, and that it would be a waste of time to draft a Bill because there is no time to give facilities for it. It is just the contrary. The present Government mean to introduce a Bill, and mean to find facilities for it; they mean to carry the Bill through, and to deal with a question which the late Government did not deal with. This Government means to find the time, and they will not allow to weigh with them an objection which Lord Onslow, when President of the Board of Agriculture, advanced as a reason for not drafting a Bill, though the late Government had ten years in which to deal with this important question. On what lines the question ought to be dealt with is a very large subject indeed, and the House will not expect me at this hour to enter into it. But there is no doubt as to the way in which the matter should be approached. We must see whether the Act of 1892 has been satisfactory; whether the county councils have really tried to purchase or hire by agreement and have failed for no fault of their own. As regards compulsory powers, which are wanting under the Act of 1892, I think we may very well take advice from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley, whose interest in this question has been so very sincere, so constant, and so consistent. The right hon. Gentleman in giving evidence before the Committee on whose Report the Act of 1892 was founded, said it was desirable not to recommend compulsion but to see how such an Act would work, and if necessary obtain compulsion in another Act thereafter. We have certainly seen that the Act of 1892 has not worked satisfactorily from the point of view of small holdings being provided generally by county councils. I am not going to blame the county councils, because they may not have had sufficient inducement to deal with this question; but it is perfectly clear that an amendment of the Act of 1892 is required, and that that very power which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley said might be necessary—the power of compulsion—will have to be applied. The right hon. Gentleman said that although it might not be possible to introduce it into that Act it might be necessary to do so in the future. It is quite clear that the time has come when it is necessary to ask for compulsory powers of purchase for county councils, and that county councils shall be made aware that this is a question with which they must deal, and that the country at large expects them to see that every opportunity is given to every labourer and every working man to get upon the land and rise. An agricultural labourer can look forward to little unless he has a prospect of acquiring a small holding and so improving his position. I venture to say that any Member of this House who is an owner of land, if he has a small holding vacant, has fifty applications for it. His great difficulty is not to select a good man but to discriminate between the many applications which are made to him. There was a reference made to-night to the fact that small holdings are let at rentals out of all proportion to the surrounding land, and even at a price which, if it does not mean failure, at all events means that the small holder is very much handicapped in making it pay with the land surrounding him let in larger quantities at lower rents. In any cases where there have been failures those failures may be traced to the fact that the man in his anxiety to get a small farm has paid more than he could afford. It has been the experience of landlords who like myself let small holdings that it has been necessary to refuse rents which have been offered for small holdings and to accept smaller rents, because the landlord knew the tenant would either fail, or live under conditions which no right-minded landlord would desire to see his tenant living under. I can only say the Government cordially accept the Motion which has been moved so ably by my hon. friend.

*MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said that apparently the Ministerial panacea for rural depopulation was the provision of small holdings. He would like to draw attention to the fact which had not been yet mentioned, that the same rural depopulation was going on in every country in Europe, even although there were to be found there the so-called advantages upon which some hon. Members laid so much stress, namely, small holdings, protection, fixity of tenure, and occupying ownership. He therefore ventured to submit to the House that the mere provision of small holdings was not the only thing which was going to stop rural depopulation in England. It would appear to be assumed by some that no small holdings existed in England at the present moment, but if they inquired they would find that the majority of holdings in this country were under fifty acres, if not under twenty-five acres. The hon. Gentleman representing the Board of Agriculture had stated that the Government were going to introduce a Small Holdings Bill. He suggested that as the noble Lord the President of the Board of Agriculture was now making some interesting experiments on land under his control, it would be better in the interests of the agricultural community as a whole to wait and see how those experiments turned out before attempting to legislate for the artificial provision of small holdings. He had grave doubts whether small holdings would be a success except under favourable conditions, and he believed that in the majority of cases they were only successful where the small holder was engaged in a subsidiary employment as well. The hon. Baronet had alluded to the Burwell Farm near Newmarket where the provision of buildings for eighty-two small holders was carried out for the small sum of £1,800. That was a very exceptional case as there were no cottages to provide, and he believed all those who were now established as small holders there gained their living in the past by driving people to the races. That was an employment they were still able to carry on.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That the progressive decline of population in rural districts is a subject of serious national concern, and that this House ought at once to take such action, legislative and administrative, as will maintain a rural population as a reservoir of national strength and a necessary condition of national well-being.—(*Mr. Rogers.*)

---

## NOTIFICATION OF BIRTHS BILL.

Read a second time and Committed to a Standing Committee.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Eleven o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Thursday, 9th May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

Great Northern and City Railway Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill. Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill. Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time To-morrow.

London County Council (Money) Bill; Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Leeds Corporation Bill. Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords]. Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

#### RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 5).

Sir LEWIS MCIVER reported from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

### *PETITIONS.*

#### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dunfermline, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

#### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Anniesland; and, Cross; to lie upon the Table.

#### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against; from Bristol; Harston; and, Leamington Spa; to lie upon the Table.

#### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Prestwich, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

#### JAMAICA.

Petition of Residents in the City of Kingston and the adjoining Parish of St. Andrew, Jamaica, for a grant in aid and for an Imperial loan to restore homes and buildings destroyed in the recent earthquake (King's recommendation signified); referred to the Committee of Supply.

### *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

#### EAST INDIA (EXCISE COMMITTEE).

Return [presented 6th May], to be printed. [No. 142.]

#### TEINDS, ETC. (SCOTLAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th December, 1906; *Mr. McCallum*]; to lie upon the Table.

#### MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy presented, of General Report and Statistics for the year 1906, Part I. (District Statistics), Statistics of the

Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the United Kingdom, arranged according to the Inspection districts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Lancaster, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Clayton-le-Moors, Oswaldtwistle, and Church Urban Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### CIVIL SERVICES (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1907-8).

Estimate presented, of the Further Amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1908, for Sundry Colonial Services [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 143.]

### EAST INDIA (ESTIMATE).

Copy presented, of Estimate of Revenue and Expenditure of the Government of India for 1906–7, compared with the results of 1905–6 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 144.]

### EAST INDIA (FINANCE AND REVENUE ACCOUNTS).

Copy presented, of Finance and Revenue Accounts of the Government of India for 1905–6 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### EAST INDIA (HOME ACCOUNTS).

Copy presented, of Home Accounts of the Government of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 145.]

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3799 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Lunacy, Copy of Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the number of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the Visitors of Lunatics between 1st October, 1906, and 31st March, 1907 [by Act.]

2. Charity Commissioners (Agricultural Land), Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 26th March; *Sir William Collins.*]

### EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS AND IRREGATION WORKS).

Address for "Return showing the estimated position, as regards capital expenditure, of the several Railways and Irrigation Works under construction in India on the 31st day of March 1907, and the proposed expenditure thereon during 1907–8 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 155, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Robert Price.*)

### EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.

Address for "Return showing the number of Experiments on Living Animals during the year 1906, under licences granted under the Act 39 and 40 Vic., c. 77, distinguishing the nature of the Experiments (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 204, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Herbert Samuel.*)

### ULTIMUS HÆRES (SCOTLAND) (ACCOUNT AND LIST OF ESTATES).

Return ordered, "of Abstract Account of the receipts and payments of the King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in Scotland, in the year ended the 31st day of December, 1906, in the administration of Estates and Treasure Trove on behalf of the Crown."

"And of Alphabetical List of Estates which fell to the Crown as Ultimus Hæres in Scotland administered by the King's and Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer in the same year."—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

### GAS UNDERTAKINGS.

Return ordered, "relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom, other than those of Local Authorities, for the year ended the 31st day of December 1906 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 393, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

### GAS UNDERTAKINGS (LOCAL AUTHORITIES).

Return ordered, "relating to all authorised Gas Undertakings in the United Kingdom, belonging to Local

Authorities for the year ended the 25th day of March, 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. **394**, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

## AMERICAN MAIL SERVICE.

Return ordered, "showing the number of days, hours, and minutes occupied in the transit of the Royal Mails, both outward and inward, carried during the years 1905 and 1906, respectively, by steamships between Queenstown and New York, between Southampton and New York, and between New York and Plymouth. The Return to specify the names of the steamers and to indicate by asterisk or otherwise those not carrying Mails under contract (in continuation of similar Return for 1904, dated 17th May, 1905)."—(*Captain Donelan.*)

---

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

---

### Irish Local Authorities and Local Traders' Tenders.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the Local Government Board auditors in Ireland will be called to the decision of the Lord Chief Justice of England, Mr. Justice Darling, and Mr. Justice Phillimore, in the London Courts on Tuesday, to the effect that local authorities are not bound to accept the lowest tender unless negligence or fraud can be shown; and whether, under these circumstances, local authorities in Ireland will be authorised to give the preference to local contractors where they are satisfied that the value is better even if the price be higher, or where they believe that the district will benefit by the expenditure being kept in the country.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board for Ireland are required by statute to decide, on appeal, as to the lawfulness of the reasons stated by auditors for making surcharges. They are consequently not in a position to give their auditors any directions as to the grounds on which their decisions should be based. Arrangements, however, were made some years ago by the Board with the object of bringing under the notice of auditors legal decisions, such as that referred to in the Question, as a guide to them in the performance of their statutory duties, and attention will be drawn to this case in the usual course. Under Section 18 of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1902, special statutory powers and duties are imposed on the auditors in cases of the acceptance of tenders for public works which are not the lowest tenders. The district councils or proposal committees who accept such tenders are not the ultimate paying authoritiy. The Board, therefore, are not in a position to authorise local authorities to act as suggested in the concluding part of the Question.

### Fleet Reserve Men and Foreign Navies.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the attention of the Board has been called to an advertisement of an agent at Portsmouth asking for volunteers for foreign warships from the Royal Navy belonging to numerous named ratings, such as torpedo and gunnery instructors, who have served their first period; whether inquiries have been made to protect men from imposition or the Royal Fleet Reserve from suffering losses; and whether the Admiralty can give any figures as to the number of men who have been trained in the Royal Navy and who subsequently joined foreign Navies since the Royal Fleet Reserve was established.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The attention of the Admiralty had not previously been called to this advertisement. The regulations prescribe that, before a Fleet Reserve man is entered, the Registrar is to satisfy himself that the man fully understands the conditions of service in the Reserve. These conditions do not admit of Fleet Reserve men residing abroad without permission and any men accepting service in a foreign Navy without permission would be liable to forfeiture of retainer and right to pension. The answer to the last part of the Question is in the negative.

### Advertising of Vacancies for Postmasterships.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether it is the rule that all vacancies for postmasterships should be advertised in the Post Office Circular, to give every officer an equal chance of making application; and, if so, whether he can state why the recent vacancy at Dungannon was not advertised; and whether he can state the date of Civil Service certificate of officer selected, and the reason for his selection.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is the general rule to advertise vacancies for postmasterships in the Post Office Circular, but it is necessary on certain rare occasions to depart from the ordinary rule for special departmental reasons, and this happened in the case of the vacancy at Dungannon. The Civil Service certificate of the officer transferred to Dungannon is dated 27th August, 1887.

### Grant for Labourers' Scheme in the Dunshaughlin Union.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in issuing the Provisional Order for the money being granted for the labourers' scheme in the Dunshaughlin Union.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Petitions against a portion of the Order in this case have been lodged with the Local Government Board and the County Court Judge. The Order has therefore been divided into two parts, relating to the opposed and unopposed portions of the scheme respectively. The loan relating to the unopposed Order can be issued as soon as the county council may apply for it, but no steps can taken in the other matter until the petitions have been adjudicated upon.

### Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants on the Estate of Captain Fitzgate, County Louth.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether two evicted farms on the estate of Captain Fitzgate, situate in the northern Parliamentary division of county Louth, were lately inspected by an inspector from the offices of the Estates Commissioners; whether the Commissioners offered to purchase the farms in question from the landlords for the purpose of reinstating two evicted tenants, originally in possession of these lands, named respectively Patrick Callan and John Wiseman; whether the Commissioners' offer was accepted by the landlord; and, if so, will he explain the delay in putting the evicted tenants into possession.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have had a preliminary inspection made of the farms in question, with the view of bringing about the restoration of the evicted tenants mentioned. The owner has expressed his willingness to sell at the Commissioners' estimated prices, and has accordingly instituted formal proceedings for sale to the Commissioners. The purchase will be carried through as soon as title has been proved and the other legal requirements have been complied with.

### Belfast Corporation and Cavehill Tramways.

MR. J. DEVLIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenent of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the menace to public interests in Ireland by reason of the operation of trusts in connection with the supply of electric power and the obtaining of control of electric tramways; whether he is aware that the Belfast Corporation is about to conclude a bargain with one of the trusts to take over the Cavehill tramways at £60,000, and that it would take £40,000 to put the tramway system in order; and that the trust threaten to secure the right to run tramways into the centre of Belfast, unless the city council come to terms with them; and whether, seeing that the tramways are run at a loss at present; that under the terms of the proposed bargain the tramway company or the trust would retain possession of a recreation ground at the tram terminus, known as Bellevue; that the Corporation of Belfast would thus be incurring a liability of £100,000 to carry passengers to and from Bellevue and that the object of the retention of Bellevue is to compel the corporation to purchase it also, he will take steps to prevent sanction being given to the terms of purchase, or to postpone the purchase until a plebiscite of the ratepayers of Belfast has been taken on the question.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I understand that a Bill was introduced earlier this session with the object of giving to the Cavehill and Whitewell Tramway Company running powers over parts of the Belfast Corporation Tramways. I have ascertained from the town clerk of Belfast that since the introduction of the Bill negotiations have taken place, with the result that the corporation have agreed to purchase the company's line for the sum of £60,000. It is stated that the present Bill is to be withdrawn, and a Bill is to be promoted next session to confirm the agreement. The hon. Member will, therefore, gather that Parliament will have full opportunity to consider the matter.

### Hearing of Land Cases in the Dingle District.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the recent sitting of the Land Commission in Tralee, a number of tenants from the Dingle district were asked to come over thirty miles to Tralee, at inconvenience and expense, and at the end of the sitting of two days had to go home without having their cases heard; whether he is aware that 300 tenants in the Dingle district have served notices to have fair rents fixed; and whether, seeing that this is a congested and highly rented district, and that very few tenants have had fair rents fixed, he will ask the Land Commission to fix a special sitting in Dingle at the earliest possible opportunity.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that the facts are substantially as stated in the Question. The sitting would in the ordinary course have taken place at Dingle, but owing to exceptional circumstances it was found necessary to hold it at Tralee. The next sitting for the district will be held at Dingle as usual. The date cannot at present be fixed, but it will be as soon as possible having regard to the claims of other districts.

### Promotion in the Customs Service.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what circumstances necessitated the issuing of Circular Letter 37/1886 compelling outdoor officers of Customs to serve for two years, exclusive of probation, before being allowed to attend any other Civil Service examination; why the terms of this circular letter were made retrospective, so as to include officers who joined during 1885 and the early portion of 1886; whether a grade, inferior in pay and prospects to that of examining officer, was created in 1886, which had the effect of practically stopping promotion to the rank of second-class examining officers until 1891; whether the regulations, showing the terms of service and prospects, issued by the Civil Service Commissioners to candidates who presented themselves for examination for the position of outdoor officer of Customs in May, 1885, and January, 1886, contained any reference to the effect the recent warehousing changes might have on the prospects of any future entrants into the service, or differed in any material respect from those issued to candidates for a similar position in 1882 and 1883, by which these officers might have been more able to forecast their prospects than those who joined in 1882 and 1883; and will he explain why the fact of their having entered in 1885 and 1886, considering they had to serve twelve to thirteen years before receiving £90 per annum, and that in the first year of their service the conditions under which they entered were twice altered to their detriment, be made a pretext for reducing the compensation for retardation of promotion; and whether, in the circumstances, he would reconsider the case of these officers and grant them the same allowance as that already granted to officers who joined under the same conditions during 1882 and 1883.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I will take the points raised by the hon. Member in the order in which they occur in his Question. (1) The reason for issuing the circular letter referred to was, as stated therein, the inconvenience caused to the Department by officers entering it merely with a view of quitting it as soon as possible. (2) This reason made it advisable to apply the restriction which was made by the circular to all officers then in the service. (3) The grade in question, viz., that of assistant examining officer, was created in 1886, but the effect was fully considered in the inquiry which led to the Treasury Minute of 24th March, 1891. (4) The Regulations issued by the Civil Service Commissioners to candidates for the position of outdoor officer in 1885 and 1886 were in the same form as in previous years, and did not contain any information as to the effect of changes in the Department on the prospects of promotion open to such candidates. On such points candidates seeking appointments in the public service must satisfy themselves, if at all, by private inquiries as to the Department offering the best prospects. (5) The compensation allowances referred to were granted in consideration, not of the two alterations mentioned in the Question, but of the retardation in promotion caused by the introduction of the new warehousing system in 1882 and 1883. (6) The changes resulting from the new system had been completed by 1885; so that officers then entering the Department were in a better position to forecast their prospects than those who entered in 1882 and 1883, and have less claim to compensation.

### Annual Leave of Assistant Clerks in the Customs (Statistical Branch).

MR. S. COLLINS (Lambeth, Kennington): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the annual leave of the new class of assistant clerks in the Statistical Office of the Customs; and whether, in view of the fact that these men remain on overtime for almost six months in the year, any extra leave is given.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The annual leave of the new class of assistant clerks in the Statistical Office of the Customs is that allowed to the class generally, viz., fourteen working days, exclusive of bank holidays, up to ten years' service, and after ten years' service eighteen working days, exclusive of bank holidays. No extra leave is given on account of extra attendance; but all such attendance is paid for at the authorised overtime rates.

### Loss of H.M.S "Ariel"—Date of Court-martial.

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty when the court-martial in connection with the loss of H.M.S. "Ariel" on Malta breakwater will take place.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) This Question is under consideration.

### Age of German Naval Recruits.

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the approximate age of recruits in the German Navy, such as form one-third of the complements of the eight principal battleships of the German North Sea Fleet; and what preliminary training, in point of time, these men have undergone.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) I understand that the approximate age is twenty to twenty-three. These men receive no preliminary training, and are recruited from the seafaring population, or, in the case of stokers and mechanics, from like trades ashore.

### Medical Inspection of Schools.

VISCOUNT VALENTIA (Oxford): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he proposes to take any, and, if so what, steps, to establish a permanent medical department at the Board of Education, with a view to secure efficient medical inspection of schools.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I must refer the noble Lord to the Answer which I gave in the House to-day upon this subject.†

### Repayment of Exchequer Bonds.

MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): To ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the sum of £9,961,500 of Exchequer Bonds running on the 6th May, 1907, includes the Exchequer Bonds repayable over the course of ten years at the rate of one million sterling a year; and what are the amounts of the various issues of the Exchequer Bonds still running.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The total of £9,961,500 is made up of—

| | £ |
|---|---|
| Exchequer Bonds under the Finance Act, 1905, redeemable by annual drawings up to 1915 - - - - | 8,000,000 |
| Exchequer Bonds under the Supplemental War Loan Act, 1900, redeemable on the 6th August, 1907 - | 1,961,500 |
| | £9,961,500 |

The following Exchequer Bonds are also current, which, having been issued for capital expenditure, are classed among

---

† See Cols. 363–4.

"Other Capital Liabilities," and do not form part of the unfunded debt—

| | £ |
|---|---|
| Exchequer Bonds under the Capital Expenditure (Money) Act, 1904 - - | 6,000,000 |
| Exchequer Bonds under the Cunard Agreement (Money) Act, 1904 - - | 2,200,000 |
| | £8,200,000 |

### Indian Railways—Shortage of Rolling Stock.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the deficiency of rolling stock in India, he will consider the proposal formerly made by the Cawnpore Chamber of Commerce that factories should provide their own goods waggons, and arrange with the railway companies concerned for their use upon hire.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) So far as I am aware there is nothing to prevent factories or private firms making arrangements with railway companies in India for supplying their own goods waggons, if suitable terms can be agreed to.

### Mansions in the Hands of the Irish Estates Commissioners.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will give the number of mansion houses and their valuation, and the number, acreage, and valuation of the demesnes, that have come into the hands of the Estates Commissioners since the passing of the Land Purchase Act of 1903; if he will state what has been done with these houses and lands; and how many acres of timber have come into the hands of the Estates Commissioners since 1903, how this timber has been disposed of, and what price it has realised.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that three mansion houses with demesnes attached, included in estates sold to them but not repurchased by the owners, have come into their hands since the passing of the Act of 1903, the combined valuation of the houses being £120 5s., and the total acreage of the demesnes attached about 746. In each case the greater part of the demesne has been either distributed amongst tenants on neighbouring estates for the enlargement of their holdings, or used for the reinstatement of evicted tenants. The mansion houses, with the remainder of the lands, including timber, have been let on leases which prohibit the lessees from cutting such timber without the Commissioners' consent. The Commissioners are not at present in a position to give a return of acreage under timber on estates purchased by them, but arrangements have been made for the sale, for £3,986, of timber on lands which have been purchased by them and are being divided among tenant purchasers, the clearing of the lands from timber being necessary in these cases for the purposes of resale.

### Inspection of the Darnley Estate, County Meath.

Mr. SHEEHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an inspection has been made of the Darnley estate, county Meath; and, if so, what has been the decision in the case of James Smith, a sub-tenant on the property, and how will his position be affected by a decree for possession obtained against him at the recent Trim sessions.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The inspection of the estate referred to has not yet been made, but the Estates Commissioners anticipate that it will take place in the course of a few months. In the meantime the Commissioners are unable to state how the sub-tenant's case may be affected by the decree stated to have been obtained against him.

### Sale of Mr. J. Philpott's Estate, County Meath.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have taken any action recently towards facilitating the completion of the sale of the estate of Mr. Joseph Philpott, Knocknacolon, Duhallow, county Cork, No. 2986 E. C., in which case five tenants signed purchase agreements in August, 1905; if the Commissioners are aware that this gentleman sold to these tenants with a view to purchase his own holding; that he is still held liable to pay a rack rent of £219 17s. to the head landlord and all tithe rent charges, and is in receipt of only £26 18s. 6d. purchase annuities from the tenants; whether the Commissioners will take into consideration the exceptional position of Mr. Philpott, with a view to have the case taken out of order and dealt with speedily in order to relieve him from payment of this head rent.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they will consider the facts of this case, with the view of deciding whether the circumstances are such as to warrant its being taken up out of its proper turn.

### Purchase of the Estate of Archdeacon Scott, County Meath.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenants on the estate of the Venerable Archdeacon Scott, situate at Cookstown, Piercetown, Valrenstown, in the county Meath, have lodged purchase agreements for their holdings as far back as the year 1904; and whether he will explain why the Commissioners have refused to advance the whole of the purchase money, and by what principles they were guided in fixing the amount to be advanced.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Purchase agreements in respect of the estate mentioned were lodged with the Estates Commissioners on the 3rd January, 1905. The Commissioners have refused to sanction the advances applied for in six of the cases. In one case the advance was refused on the ground of insufficient security. In the other five cases the advances applied for exceeded in each case the sum of £3,000 which is the limit imposed by Section 2 of the Act of 1888, and the Commissioners, in the exercise of their discretion, decided not to sanction advances in excess of this amount.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Jonathan Dann.

MR. PATRICK WHITE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Jonathan Dann, at present residing in Roscrea, and formerly evicted from the lands of Whitepark, near Roscrea, by Samuel Maxwell, Glenalbert, Roscrea, county Tipperary, has applied for reinstatement in his former holding; and will he state what action has been taken in this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have referred this man's application to an inspector for investigation. As soon as the inspector's Report has been received the case will be duly considered.

### Salary of Mr. J. T. Drennan.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners had proposed to pay a salary of £400 to Mr. J. T. Drennan; and was that sum increased to £500 at the suggestion of Sir Robert Holmes, Treasury Remembrancer.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The reply to both parts of the Question is in the negative.

### Royal Irish Constabulary Force Fund.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware of the existence of an agitation for a number of years back among the Royal Irish Constabulary pensioners of the United Kingdom, requesting the immediate winding up of the Constabulary Force Fund; is he aware that his predecessor stated that the Constabulary Force Fund would be wound up as soon as possible; and, seeing that twelve months has passed since then, how soon will the Government be able to carry out this undertaking.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not aware that my predecessor made any statement as to the winding up of this fund, save that it was being gradually wound up by meeting its obligations to widows and orphans of subscribers as they arise. This process of winding up was provided by the Act of 1883, which closed the fund to new entrants, and no more summary method of winding it up is possible.

### Army Pensions—Case of Hugh Craig.

MR. W. BENN (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of

Hugh Craig, who, after serving in the Army Hospital Corps in 1882, and subsequently in 1900 in the Imperial Yeomanry at Pretoria, where he was injured, was discharged from Netley in receipt of 3s. 6d. a day, in addition to an original pension of 1s.; whether the 3s. 6d. has now been stopped; if so, for what reason; and whether he can see his way to have it continued.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This man, on admission to the Herbert Hospital to consider his claim to a renewal of his temporary pension, refused to submit himself to sufficient medical examination. It is not, therefore, possible to consider his claim to further pension. He has been repeatedly informed to this effect.

### Army Pensions—Case of S. Lisle.

MR. W. BENN: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of S. Lisle, who served in the Royal Marines from 1st July 1880 to 1st July 1892, and subsequently, in 1893, joined the 4th Essex, in which he served a term of six years, 321 days, and from which he was invalided; and whether Lisle is entitled to any pension or gratuity, in view of the fact that he is at present suffering from paralysis and has lost the sight of the right eye.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This man's service in the Essex Regiment cannot be traced. If my hon. friend will kindly forward further particulars, giving dates of enlistment and discharge, the case shall be investigated.

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Sale of Obsolete War Ships.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): On behalf of the hon. Member for Lynn Regis, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that we place no restriction on the sale of new warships to foreign Powers, the Board will consider the advisability, in the case of the sale of obsolete ships, of allowing them to be bought without any provision as to their being broken up in this country; and whether this practice cannot be tried as an experiment, on a small scale, in order to ascertain how far it is desirable to extend it.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): Obsolete ships are not in all cases sold on condition that they are to be broken up in this country. The circumstances of each case are separately considered.

MR. WATT: Has the right hon. Gentleman received any approximate estimate of the prices which would be obtained if the ships sold recently had had not been sold subject to the stipulation that they should be broken up?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have not.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): Have any applications been received from the Colonies for any of these ships to be used for training or other purposes?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I do not think so.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, before selling any more of our old soft-ended battleships, or ships which have no armour at the bow and stern, the Board will take into consideration the small price realised, and the advisability of utilising one of them as a target in order to test what would happen to the many soft-ended battleships in the British Navy if their ends are fired at with high explosive shells from the large number of 6-inch and 6·5-inch guns carried in foreign warships.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It is not proposed to utilise one of the ships of this type as a target for the purpose suggested. The professional advisers of the Admiralty do not consider that any additional information, at all commensurate with the expense involved, could be obtained in this way.

### Dangerous Derelicts at Sea.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that many

British vessels are lost at sea, presumably through collision with derelicts, the Admiralty will consider the desirability of commissioning one of the vessels of the Reserve Fleet to search the seas for these dangers to navigation and destroy them.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: This question was considered in 1894 by a Joint Committee of the Admiralty and Board of Trade, which reported against the hon. Member's suggestion. This report was presented to the House. (Cd. 7568 of Session 1894.)

### Rosyth.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under Lyme): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he has formed any estimate of the increase in the value of the land surrounding Rosyth which will result from the establishment there of a Government dockyard; and whether he has considered the advisability of making some arrangement to secure the improved value for the State before proceeding with any important work at Rosyth.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No estimate has been formed, and it would be difficult to form an accurate one. As to the second point, I understand that the Crown acquired an area, much larger than would otherwise have been necessary, with this object in view.

### Naval Contracts for Beer.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty to what firm the contract for beer to be supplied to the fleet in Home waters has been given for the year 1907–8.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No beer is bought by the Admiralty for issue to the Fleet, but a certain quantity is contracted for on behalf of the War Office and India Office for issue on the transports. This contract is at present held by Meux & Company, the lowest tenderers.

SIR F. BANBURY: Can the right hon. Gentleman inform the House if the First Lord of the Admiralty has any interest in that firm?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I cannot give any such information.

### County Associations—Audit of Accounts.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the accounts of the county associations will be audited by the War Office auditors or by outside chartered accountants.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): I am about to lay before the House a statement showing the manner in which the territorial associations will be financed. The main portion of the grant will be based upon certificates of results; not upon expenditure in detail. The position of the War Office in regard to this audit will therefore be that which has obtained in regard to the Volunteers. The grants will, however, be applicable only to authorised objects, sub-serving the efficiency of the Forces; and it will probably be proposed that their appropriations to such purposes and their record in proper and duly vouched accounts should be secured by audit by qualified chartered accountants.

### Compulsory Drill in Schools.

MR. BRIGHT (Oldham): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Salford, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that compulsion to join in miniature rifle shooting and military drill already exists in several schools connected with the Head Masters' Association and a number of preparatory schools; whether he contemplates an extension of this compulsory military training in schools; and whether State-aid for such training, which was recently disavowed by the Government in connection with elementary schools, is proposed in the case of secondary schools.

MR. HALDANE: The Government has no intention of making any grant for the purpose of introducing compulsion of any kind, and I may say generally that the question of compulsory military drill and miniature rifle shooting in schools does not, and cannot, come within the sphere of influence of the Army Council.

### Freights to the West Coast of Africa.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the

Colonies what weight of steel rails and sleepers was shipped to Lagos, Southern Nigeria, and the Gold Coast in the year 1906–7; and what was the average freight charged from the port of production to free on quay at the West Coast.

The following Question also stood on the Paper:—

MR. WEDGWOOD: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies who placed the contract for the rails and sleepers for the West Coast Colonies and the contract for the freightage thither, and with whom were the orders and freightage placed; and were tenders called for by open advertisement, or what firms were asked to tender for supply and for freightage.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): It will be convenient to deal with this and the next Question of the hon. Member together. The contracts for rails and sleepers and for their freight were placed by the Crown Agents as agents for the Colonies concerned. The contracts for freight were placed with Elder Dempster and Company. As regards the system followed by the Crown Agents in contracting for stores for Colonial Governments, I must refer the hon. Member to the Parliamentary Paper published in 1904 (Cd. 1944) in which full explanations are given. The further information asked for could be furnished, but its compilation would involve considerable labour, necessitating examination of records for the past ten years. The Secretary of State is not prepared to direct that this should be done, but if the hon. Member will apply to the Crown Agents direct they will be happy to give him any particulars which he may require. It should be borne in mind that the railways in question were constructed at the expense of the respective Colonies, and that the British taxpayer bore no part of their expense.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Are the Government satisfied that the retention of Crown Agents makes for the efficiency of the Consular Service?

MR. CHURCHILL: I have no hesitation in saying that the Government are of opinion that the retention of Crown Agents is entirely in the interests of efficiency and economy.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I want to get at the freights actually charged.

MR. CHURCHILL: If the hon. Gentleman will go to the Crown Agents' Office he will be able to get all the particulars.

### Nigerian Railways—Freights for Material.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the orders for freight of material required for the future railways in Northern and Southern Nigeria will be placed through the Crown Agents, or will Sir Percy Girouard, with his experience of railway construction, be given a free hand to deal himself directly with the cheapest market.

MR. CHURCHILL: As no railway construction has yet been authorised in Northern Nigeria, it is premature to say how the orders for freight will be placed, but such orders would presumably be placed by the Crown Agents, as agents for the Government of Northern Nigeria, on the most advantageous terms obtainable. The same course will be followed in the case of railway extension in Southern Nigeria.

In reply to a further Question by Mr. WEDGWOOD,

MR. CHURCHILL said that in the event of any railway construction being authorised in Northern Nigeria the Government hoped to be able to avail themselves of Sir Percy Girouard's experience in order to secure that the line was built at as low a cost as possible, but he could not say if the Crown Agents would be employed on a railway line the building of which had not yet been decided upon.

### West African Deep-Water Landing Places.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether all the deep-water landing places in the British West African Colonies are owned by companies controlled by Sir Alfred Jones, so that other shippers cannot compete in carrying freight there;

if this is not so, will he give a list of those ports which are not controlled by Sir Alfred Jones; and, if the monopoly is at all serious, will the Government themselves construct publicly-owned deep-water landing stages to permit of free competition, before any public money is spent on importing extensive railway material at artificially high rates.

MR. CHURCHILL: There is no British Colony in West Africa where the deep-water landing places are owned by companies controlled by Sir Alfred Jones, so that the monopoly referred to does not exist.

### New Transvaal Loan.

SIR JOSEPH LEESE (Lancashire, Accrington): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government have been approached with the object of granting a further loan to the Transvaal Government.

MR. CHURCHILL: General Botha has informed the Secretary of State that it is the intention of his Government to propose to the Transvaal Legislature a Bill authorising a loan of £5,000,000 upon the credit of the Transvaal, for the purposes *inter alia* of irrigation works, for completing railway development, for the establishment of a land bank, and generally in pursuance of the policy of £35,000,000 guaranteed loan. He has asked His Majesty's Government whether they would be willing to assist the Transvaal Government by an Imperial guarantee. Having regard to the special circumstances which distinguish the Transvaal at the present time from every other responsible self-governing Colony, His Majesty's Government have intimated their willingness in principle to afford such a guarantee if and when the necessary legislation shall have been passed by the Transvaal Legislature.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Has no mention been made in these discussions of the £30,000,000?

MR. CHURCHILL replied in the negative, and was understood to add that the Government had already announced that they had relinquished that claim.

### Disturbances in Morocco.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information as to the rebellion in the South of Morocco; and whether any steps are being taken to safeguard British subjects within the districts affected.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): His Majesty's Minister at Tangier considers the published reports as exaggerated. News has reached him that one of the disaffected tribes is threatening to interfere with the Sultan's administration in Morocco City. It has not yet been possible to obtain confirmation of these reports, which do not, however, point to any unusual danger affecting British subjects.

MR. ASHLEY: Does the Sultan's writ run in the South of Morocco?

SIR EDWARD GREY: There is always a certain amount of disturbance in the South of Morocco.

### The Oddfellows and Land Tax.

MR. THORNTON (Clapham): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that branches of the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows which hold land under the authority given by the Friendly Societies Act have until recently been exempt from payment of the land tax, and that during the past six months demands for payment of the tax have been made in different parts of the country; if so, will he say what is the reason for the change in practice, and will the land tax, which has been collected from branches of the Manchester Unity, or from any other registered friendly society, be refunded on application, as is the case with tax on income from any other source.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): There is no exemption from land tax in favour of friendly societies as such; but under Section 12 of the Finance Act, 1896, persons exempt from income-tax by reason of their incomes not exceeding £160 are relieved from payment of land tax. The Commissioners of Inland Revenue are advised that the recent decision of the House of Lords in the case of Curtis *v.* The Old Monkland Conservative Association has the effect of depriving all bodies, corporate or unincorporate, of the income-tax exemption on the ground of smallness of total income, and consequently of the land tax exemption also, and the change of practice is consequent upon that decision.

### Paddington Borough Councils and Home Workers.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he has now received from the Paddington Borough Council any explanation of their refusal to take proceedings against local traders who had failed to supply the names and addresses of home-workers employed by them.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have now received a letter from the Council stating that they have reconsidered the matter, and have adopted the following resolution:—"That the solicitor be instructed to take steps to secure the outstanding lists of home-workers employed in this borough, and if necessary, to take proceedings against one firm or employer as a test case." I have asked the Council to let me know the result of the steps which they have decided to take.

### Privileged Cabs.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is still negotiating with the various railway companies having termini in London with reference to the abolition of the privileged cab system; and, if so, whether he can state if he has been successful in coming to a satisfactory arrangement.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is yet in a position to make a definite statement as to the abolition of the privileged cab system.

MR. GLADSTONE: The negotiations with the railway companies in which, as I have already stated in Answer to previous Questions, I have been engaged, have been somewhat prolonged, partly owing to the number of companies concerned. I trust that a satisfactory arrangement may be arrived at. If not I propose to introduce legislation on the subject at an early date.

### The Zoological Gardens.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that it is still the practice at the Zoological Gardens in Regent's Park to feed the pythons and other large snakes on living animals, including goats and kids, in spite of the testimony of the directors of the New York Zoological Park and other menageries that the reptiles can be fed successfully on newly-killed animals; and whether, in view of the difficulty of obtaining evidence by reason of the fact that the public are not admitted when the snakes are fed, he will institute a police inquiry in order to see that the law for the prevention of cruelty to animals is not infringed.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have made inquiry of the Secretary to the Zoological Society who informs me as follows:—"The authorities of the Society are personally acquainted with the practices of other gardens, including those of New York, and living prey is never given to serpents that will take dead prey." The Secretary has offered to give exact information to the Secretary of the Humanitarian League, and I have no doubt he would do the same for any responsible body. In the circumstances I see no ground for taking any action.

### Missing Vessels and Derelicts.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can give the number of British vessels posted as missing during the last ten years whose loss is attributed to collision with derelicts.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): As the causes of vessels being missing are entirely matters of conjecture, I cannot undertake to say how many of such losses have been attributed to collisions with derelicts during the last ten years, and I am not aware that any reliable evidence has been forthcoming at an inquiry or elsewhere that a vessel has probably been lost from such cause.

### Trade with South Africa.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that whereas in 1898 the total value of exports into South Africa from all sources amounted to £23,905,516, of which the British share was 69·4 per cent., in 1906 the total imports were £29,859,672, of which the British share was 56·8, while the share of competing foreign countries had increased from 19·5 per cent. to 21·8 per cent.; whether he can explain this comparative falling off of British trade; and whether the Government have formulated any proposals as an alternative to a preferential tariff, with the object of improving trade relations between the United Kingdom and South Africa.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The figures quoted as to the total value of imports into South Africa appear to be in substantial agreement with the Colonial trade returns. It should, however, be mentioned that the 1906 figures, which are compiled by the South African Statistical Bureau, are exclusive of Colonial Government stores. The proportion of imports from the United Kingdom in 1906 were somewhat less than in 1898, but not quite to the extent stated, owing to the exclusion of Government stores, which are largely imported from the United Kingdom. The causes which have affected this trade cannot be satisfactorily dealt with in answer to a Question, but I may say that the decreased proportion of trade with the United Kingdom is partly accounted for by the increased importation of foodstuffs from British possessions. Any practical proposal to improve trade relations between the United Kingdom and South Africa would receive the careful and sympathetic consideration of the Government.

### Railway Companies and Luggage Insurance.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether railway companies claiming limited liability for uninsured luggage, under the Carriers Act of 1830, to the extent of £10 provide means for its insurance when accompanying its owners.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Yes, Sir, so far as I am aware, such provision is made.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN: Is or ought not the information to be published in the time table?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I will make inquiry.

### Swindon Guardians' Disqualification.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.); I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the Swindon Board of Guardians declaring a seat vacant of one of its members on the grounds of his accepting Poor Law relief, in consequence of his sleeping in one of the casual wards for one night with a view of finding out what kind of treatment the casual ward people were receiving; and whether he proposes to take action in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): My attention has been drawn to this case. A member of a Board of Guardians is disqualified under Section 46 of the Local Government Act, 1894, if within twelve months before his election, or at any time after it, he has received union or parochial relief. The section further provides that where a member becomes disqualified for holding office the Board of Guardians shall declare the office to be vacant. If the`action of the Guardian in question has brought him within the section, I am not empowered to remove the disqualification.

### Commons and Rights of Way.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state in how many cases local authorities have interfered under the Act of 1894 to prevent enclosure of commons or to protect paths or rights of way; in how many they have been successful, and in how many they have failed.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am not able to give my hon. friend the particulars he desires. The Act does not require the local authorities to notify to the Local Government Board any action taken by them in relation to this matter.

### West London Central Church, Westbourne Grove.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been directed to the fact that the Assessment Committee of the Paddington Borough Council have now assessed to local rates the West London Central Church, Westbourne Grove, on the ground that they have, by using the church for social work, infringed the Act, 3 and 4 Will. IV., chapter 30, section 1, which provides that churches and chapels shall not be rated as long as they are exclusively appropriated to public religious worship; and whether, if the council's action be upheld, he will introduce legislation to prevent the law being used to stop work which is so much needed in Paddington and similar places.

MR. JOHN BURNS: My attention has been drawn to this case. I have noted the suggestion made by my hon. friend, but I cannot promise to introduce legislation on this subject.

### Malton Rural District Water Supply.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has received complaints from the Malton Rural District Council and other local authorities to the effect that they are unable to secure proper water supplies for their districts, owing to the difficulty of coming to terms with riparian owners; and whether he will introduce a measure to enable the Board to issue Provisional Orders for the compulsory acquisition of water rights in such cases.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have received representations on this subject. I will give consideration to the suggestion in the latter part of the Question, but I cannot promise to introduce a Bill dealing with the matter during the present session.

MR. LEIF JONES: Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind how exceedingly pressing this matter is?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes, this and other cases will, in my judgment, necessitate legislation at an early date.

### Motor 'Bus Smoke.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to a judgment of the Lord Chief Justice, on 26th April, in the appeal case of the Star Omnibus Company, Limited, *v.* the Mayor and Borough of Camberwell, in which the learned Judge reversed the decision of a Metropolitan magistrate who had fined the plaintiff company for emitting smoke from a motor 'bus caused through negligence of over-lubrication on the grounds that, as the said 'bus exceeded three tons in weight, Section 30 of the Locomotive Act of 1878 did not apply, and that the Heavy Motor Car Order, 1904, placed motor 'buses outside Section 1 of the Act of 1896; and if he will, in view of this decision, cancel the Order of 1904 in order to prevent this nuisance.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have seen a newspaper report of the case referred to, but I do not gather from it that the Lord Chief Justice stated that the Heavy Motor Order placed motor omnibuses outside Section 1 of the Act of 1896. Its effect was, in fact, to bring them within that section. The difficulty in the matter arises out of the wording of the section, and this could only be altered by legislation.

MR. MARKHAM: Is it not the fact that as a result of the decision motor 'buses are now able to emit smoke and do not come under any penalty for doing so?

MR. JOHN BURNS: My hon. friend will forgive me if I do not return the Answer he would like, but when the Lord Chief Justice and the magistrate disagree on a technical point like this a humble layman like myself cannot instruct them.

### The Post Office and Lottery Circulars.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Members of this House recently received by post, in envelopes officially franked by the British postal authorities, a circular relating to the Great Royal Saxon State Money

Lottery, holding out the chance of a money prize which, it was represented, would, if paid in shillings and put one on the top of the other, be about ten times as high as Westminster Palace; and whether he will take steps to ascertain by whom the circulars were lodged for franking and to bring to justice the persons responsible for this violation of the Lottery Act.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): If the hon. Member will furnish me with a copy of the circular and envelope to which he refers, I will make inquiry, and, if necessary, communicate with the police authorities, with whom any question of prosecution rests. I may point out that the "official frank" to which the hon. Member refers merely shows that the postage has been paid, and confers no official character whatever on letters on which it is placed. I have, of course, no power to open closed envelopes for the purpose of ascertaining the nature of their contents.

MR. MARKHAM: Will the right hon. Gentleman also make inquiries as to other financiers who hold out chances of money prizes which invariably never come off?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Any circular emanating from any quarter if it contravenes the law should be brought to my notice, and I will thereupon communicate with the proper authorities.

MR. BOTTOMLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman extend his inquiry to the circulars of mining engineers?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Board of Education and Medical Inspection of Schools.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he proposes to create a medical department in connection with the Board of Education, so as to supervise and co-ordinate local work done in connection with the medical inspection of school children; and whether, in order to create such a department, legislation is necessary.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of the fact that it is not competent for a private Member to move in Committee on the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill for the establishment of a permanent medical department at the Board of Education, he can say now what medical machinery the Board intend to adopt to carry out the proposals of the Bill; and, if he cannot give this information, whether he will say on the advice of what experts or reports he intends to act.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I regret I cannot yet add anything to the Answer which I gave to my hon. friend the Member for West Bradford on 15th March to the effect that it would be premature to decide what machinery will be required by the Board of Education on the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill becoming law, but my hon. friend may rest assured that I am fully alive to the importance of this question. The staff of the Board of Education can be increased with the consent of the Treasury without legislation. I may add that the Board's staff already includes two medical men.

MR. WEDGWOOD asked on the advice of what experts the right hon. Gentleman intended to act.

MR. McKENNA: The whole subject at the time of last year's Bill was considered by experts, whose names are too numerous to mention.

MR. WEDGWOOD: It is not the fact that the clause dealing with medical inspection of school children was added in opposition to the wishes of the Government?

MR. McKENNA was understood to reply that the hon. Member was not entitled to say that.

### Nomenclature for Non-provided Schools—Skipton National School.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of the fact that a circular, No. 549, addressed, 15th November, 1906, to the managers of the national school, Skipton, relating to the new nomenclature for non-provided schools then in preparation, that a properly convened meeting of those managers considered the circular on 11th December, 1906, and resolved that, by reason of there being two Church of England schools in the town, in order to avoid confusion, they would choose the name of Skipton Parish Church School, and sent a copy of this resolution to the local education authority, and that those managers were informed, on 18th April, 1907, that the name of the school as printed in the forthcoming list will be Skipton Parish Church of England, he will state why the wishes of the managers have been disregarded and the words "of England" added to the epithet.

MR. MCKENNA: The Board considered that wherever "Church" was proposed the full name "Church of England" should be used, and this rule was followed in the case of the Skipton school. But I am considering, in connection with the next issue of the list, whether any modification of this rule should be allowed in these cases where the name "Parish Church" was asked for.

### Nomenclature for Non-provided Schools—"Church of England" Schools.

MR. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he will cancel the new official list of several thousands of elementary denominational schools to which the epithet Church of England has been given, in view of the statement of his predecessor that in the great majority of cases the excision of the word national from the title of the schools would not necessitate the insertion of any other phrase, Church of England or anything else, in its place, that it would be only in the small minority of cases where the excision would cause confusion between one school and another, that a distinctive term of some kind would be required, and that the contemplated official list would be of a temporary character; and whether he will compile another list, after consultation with the local education authorities interested therein, on the principles laid down by his predecessor on 20th December, 1906.

MR. MCKENNA: For the reasons given in my Answer to my hon. friend on 30th April,† I have not found it possible to restrict the use of the term "Church of England" to schools where the omission of a distinctive epithet would cause confusion. Some seven thousand schools are involved in the change, and the staff of the Board would be quite inadequate to admit of the local circumstances in each case being individually considered. It was, therefore, necessary to proceed on certain general principles. The list of schools is an annual publication, and I shall be prepared to consider any objection to specific names which may be submitted to me.

### Grants to University Colleges.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the colleges participating in the grant of £100,000 to university colleges in 1906 were the same as those participating in the grant of £27,000 in 1904; whether the same colleges will participate in the grant of £100,000 estimated for during the present financial year; and on what principle the grant is allocated.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. A Committee which has been appointed to advise the Treasury as to the distribution of the grant will consider what colleges are to participate in the grant in the present financial year, and on what principle the grant is to be allocated.

### Report of Inspectors of University Colleges.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury when the Report of the inspectors of university colleges for the last financial year was received; and when it will be laid upon the Table.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I hope the Report will be received before the end of the month. It will probably be laid soon after it is received.

### West Riding Secondary School for Girls.

MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster whether application has been made by the Pontefract Secondary Education

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 702–3.

Committee for the purchase of three and a-half acres of land, situated near Tanshelf station, for the purpose of enabling the authority to comply with the requirements of the West Riding County Council for the erection of a secondary school for girls; whether the land has been offered by the Duchy on a lease for ninety-nine years at a rental of £60 or £20 per acre per annum; whether the Chancellor is aware that no other suitable site is available for the erection of a school; and, if so, whether he is prepared to advise an offer on terms more favourable to the district, seeing that the land is now let at an agricultural rental of about 40s. per acre.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Sir HENRY FOWLER, Wolverhampton, E.): I have received an application from the Pontefract Secondary Education Committee for the purchase of land for the erection of a secondary school for girls. I am advised by the Surveyor-General of the Duchy that building land in the neighbourhood in a much less favourable position has been let by the Duchy on building leases at the same rate as that named to the Education Committee. The matter has been fully considered by the Council of the Duchy, and they are of opinion that the land should not be let at less than its value.

### Scudamore Charity for Decayed Men at Hereford.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Elland, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether he is aware that in 1839 a sum of £100 per year was left by the Honourable Mrs. Scudamore, of Holme Lacy, Hereford, for the benefit of ten poor decayed men; whether he is aware that one of the recipients of this charity is a farmer who has two farms of about 300 acres, and holds several public positions, such as district and parish councillor, school manager, and guardian; whether this recipient has drawn the amount of £10 per year for several years; and whether he will take the necessary steps towards compelling him to return the money obtained, which was left for an entirely different purpose.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): Complaint has been made to the Charity Commissioners that a person described as a small farmer has been a recipient of this charity, and for this and other difficulties in regard to the administration of the charity, the case has been referred to an Assistant Commissioner for inquiry. He now has been in communication with the trustees and the inquiry will be held, if a day generally convenient can be fixed, in the second week of June next.

### Whale Killing and the Herring Fishery.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that there is a considerable increase in the number of steamers employed in the killing of whales; if he is aware that the local authority is powerless to exercise any control or to mitigate the public nuisance and danger arising from vast masses of putrifying flesh about the stations; if he is aware that the Norwegians protested so strongly against whaling stations on their coast that a law was passed forbidding them for a considerable period; if he is aware that since British and Foreign companies have been actively engaged in the indiscriminate slaughter of whales the herring fishing on the West Coast has been rapidly falling off, and that this year a certain station where three years ago 300 vessels were employed there are now none; and if he will consider the advisability of introducing a Bill to regulate in some degree the operations now going on.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The information in the first and third portions of my hon. friend's Question is new to me; in regard to the second, I understand that although one of the provisions in the by-laws has been held by the sheriff substitute to be *ultra vires*, the other provisions remain and should be enforced, so that the local authority are not powerless, as suggested by my hon. friend; they can compel removal of any nuisance found to exist, and have made by-laws dealing with the conduct of the whaling industry; the fourth portion is an expression of opinion, and a matter of controversy. And in regard to the last portion, I have already introduced a Bill which is now before the House and which proposes to regulate this industry.

MR. CATHCART WASON: Is it the case that local authorities have practically no control over this nuisance?

*MR. J. DEWAR (Inverness): Is it not the case that local authorities have issued an instruction which is loyally carried out insisting that the carcase of the whale must be cleared away in forty-eight hours, and was not the fishing at Barra, the most important fishing station on the West Coast of Scotland, the most prosperous on record last year at the very time the whalers were most active?

MR. SINCLAIR: That is so, Sir.

### House Letting in Scotland.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that, at a meeting of the Scottish Trades Union Congress, held in Aberdeen last week, attended by 132 delegates from trades unions from all parts of Scotland, representing 122,000 tradesmen, the house-letting question was considered, and a resolution passed in favour of reform; and whether, in view of the importance of this question, he will say when the Report of the Departmental Committee, which some time ago concluded its inquiry on this subject, will be issued.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Committee have finished taking evidence, and will lose no time in preparing their Report. But I am not able to name any date.

### Scottish Estimates.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will arrange for the Reports of the Fishery Board and the Local Government Board for Scotland to be in the hands of Members before the Votes are taken.

MR. SINCLAIR: As my hon. friend is aware, Scottish Estimates will probably be taken on 30th May, which is somewhat earlier than usual. Every effort will be made by the Departments to prepare and issue their Reports in time; but I am a little doubtful.

### Bazaar Raffles in Scotland.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Lord-Advocate whether his attention has been called to the system of raffling at bazaars in connection with churches and clubs in Scotland; why, if this practice is contrary to law, the authorities do not institute proceedings; and if, in view of the fact that the law has fallen into disuse, he will introduce legislation to make the practice legal.

The following Questions were also on the Paper:—

MR. WATT: To ask the Lord-Advocate whether his attention has been called to the fact that newspapers in Scotland published particulars and results of raffles in connection with church bazaars and clubs; why, if this practice is contrary to law, the authorities do not institute proceedings; and if, in view of the fact that the law has fallen into disuse, he will introduce legislation to make the practice legal.

MR. SUTHERLAND (Elgin Burghs): To ask the Lord-Advocate, in view of the fact that during a long period of years almost every bazaar held in Scotland has had as part of its equipment the subscription sale system, that the attitude of the criminal authorities has induced not only local authorities, but the public generally, to treat the law on the subject as obsolete, and that arrangements and commitments have been made in good faith in connection with bazaars for this year, whether he can make any statement on the future policy of his Department in the matter which will be a guide to persons promoting undertakings of a charitable nature.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burgh): I may be allowed to answer this and the two succeeding Questions together. These practices—whether called raffling or subscription sales, or plainly denominated lotteries—appear to be contrary to law. For some years the law was not enforced with rigour; and a certain practice appears to have arisen of allowing its non-observance in view of the good objects which it was urged an evasion of the law would promote. Various appeals have reached me on this head from churches and clubs, and in at least one case from a local trades council, and I have answered all of them by refusal. It has not been decided that the law is in desuetude. On the contrary it has recently been enforced, and criminal conviction obtained. In addition, numerous warnings have been given. The only authority which can sanction schemes as exceptions to the general law is the authority of the Act of Parliament. I have no such authority, but am bound to administer the law irrespective of whether the delinquents are or are not actuated by philanthropic motives. With reference to the concluding Question by my hon. friend the Member for Elgin, persons promoting charitable undertakings must, I fear, expect no further warning than this Answer.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): In view of the fact that the State recognises that the churches are committing a breach of the law, cannot an exception be made on behalf of friendly societies when doing a like thing on behalf of a widow?

MR. THOMAS SHAW: We cannot take into account the motive when enforcing the law.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS: Is it intended to prosecute in all these cases?

MR. THOMAS SHAW: I have no doubt a prosecution will take place in the ordinary course on information being laid.

### Leitrim Evicted Tenant—Case of James Daly.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received their inspector's Report with regard to the reinstatement of James Daly, Kiltoghert, Carrick-on-Shannon, an evicted tenant on the Lauder and Gumley Estate, in county Leitrim; and, as this man is at present in receipt of outdoor relief, if arrangements will be made to have him reinstated at once on the farm of land which he formerly held.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners have inquired into James Daly's application for reinstatement in a holding which is now occupied by another tenant. The Commissioners do not consider Daly to be a suitable person for reinstatement.

### Lord Gough's Gort Estate.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have succeeded in completing negotiations for the sale and purchase between Lord Gough, *chargé d'affaires* at Dresden, and his tenantry on the Lough Cutra property, Gort; and, if not, will he take measures to try and bring about this most desired result.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have had several interviews with Lord Gough and the tenants' representatives and as a result the landlord agreed to sell the tenanted holdings at such prices as the Commissioners should consider reasonable, and also to sell such untenanted lands as the Commissioners should think necessary at the Commissioners' price. Lord Gough, however, made it a condition that the sporting rights should be reserved to him as he intended to reside at Lough Cutra, and upon the tenants demurring to this he offered to agree that if the tenants' crops should be damaged by game, he would pay such compensation as the Land Commission might consider proper. Lord Gough's offer appeared to the Commissioners to be reasonable, but the tenants refused to accept it, and the negotiations, therefore, came to an end. The Commissioners do not see that they can take any further action in the matter.

### Uneconomic Holdings near Gort.

MR. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the attention of the Estates Commissioners has been directed to the uneconomic condition of a number of annuitant holders of land in the townland of Roo, near Gort, county Galway; and whether, in view of the proximity of their holdings to the large grazing farm of Ballyvoher, in the hands of the landlord, Mr. W. S. Taylor, of Castle Taylor, Ardrahan, he will instruct the Commissioners to open negotiations with Mr. Taylor so as to try and secure this untenanted land in the interest of the Government tenants.

MR. BIRRELL: Mr. Shawe Taylor has agreed to sell to the Estates Commissioners as much of his untenanted land as they may require. The Commissioners have decided to take 616 acres, and a further area of 347 acres is available if they should require it. The townland of Ballyvoher, comprising 160 acres, was offered to the Commissioners, but they consider this land to be unsuitable for their purpose.

### Galway Poor Rate Collectors.

MR. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that the Local Government Board have put into operation the Public Bodies Order for 1904, in the county of Galway, and that, under this Order, poor rate collectors had to enter into new bonds; whether the new bonds compelled them to lodge the full amount of their warrants, whether collectable or otherwise, at the end of each financial year; and whether he will instruct the Local Government Board not to carry forward at present irrecoverable arrears into the new warrants in cases where the collector is prepared to make an affidavit that these arrears are irrecoverable.

MR. BIRRELL: The facts are substantially as stated in the Question. The Public Bodies Order, however, provides that when the collections of rates have been closed the lists of arrears are to be submitted to the county council for their consideration, and subsequently to the Local Government Board; and any arrears which are declared to be irrecoverable are to be refunded to the collectors. The present system has been found to work satisfactorily, and does not impose any undue hardship on the collectors. When any exceptional circumstances exist in any collection district, the Board always give the case full consideration.

### Irish Council Bill Grant.

CAPTAIN WARING (Banffshire): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the £650,000 to be given to Ireland is an extra grant out of the Imperial purse; and, if so, whether the equivalent grant will be given to Scotland.

MR. ASQUITH: If effect is given by Parliament to the proposals made in the Irish Council Bill, the additional sum assigned to Irish services will be a charge against the Exchequer of the United Kingdom. Until the Bill has become law, I think it would be premature to discuss the suggestion contained in the second part of the Question; but I may say at once, that as at present advised, the case does not appear to me to be one to which the principle, or rather the practice, of equivalent grants is applicable.

### County Clare—Deductions from Parliamentary Grants.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state the amount of Parliamentary Grants in relief of rates recently deducted from county Clare; and if he will state the causes of such deduction and the amount in each instance.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The proportion, of the total amount drawn from the Guarantee Fund in 1907, chargeable to County Clare amounted to £870 11s. 8d. This sum is made up as follows:—Drawn under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, £272; Drawn under the Irish Land Act, 1903—Arrears of Annuities, £164; Unearned dividend on issues of stock, £167; Advarice dividend, £96; Interest due but not received, £109; Unproductive balance, £63; total, £871.

### Ballinspittle Mails.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the change made in the despatch of mails from Ballinspittle, county Cork, from 4.45 p.m. to 2 p.m. on Sundays has caused inconvenience in the district; and whether, seeing that under the old system letters could be answered on the day on which they were received, and that under the new system this had been rendered impossible, under these circumstance he will cause the old system to be reverted to.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I have called for a Report on this subject, and on its receipt I will send the hon. Member a reply.

---

## SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill): Mr. Secretary Gladstone and Mr. Herbert Samuel; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill): Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Kearley.

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee A the following fifteen Members in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill: Sir William Holland, Mr. Holden, Mr. Isaacs, Sir Andrew Torrance, Mr. Beale, Mr. Raphael, Major Dunne, Mr. George Greenwood, Sir William Hornby, Mr. Brotherton, Colonel Warde, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. Nicholls, Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Haviland-Burke.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

## *NEW BILL.*

### TEACHERS OF MUSIC REGISTRATION BILL.

"To provide for the Registration of Teachers of Music," presented by Mr. O'Neill; supported by Sir John Brunner, Sir Henry Craik, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, and Mr. George White; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 191.]

### SUPPLY [8TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

### CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

### REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs."

*THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I propose to make some general observations with regard to the work of the Post Office during the year. I am sorry I am not able to give so favourable an account of the financial position of the Post Office as was the case last year. It is true there has been a considerable addition to the revenue, but the increase has not been so great as was expected twelve months ago. While the general trade of the country has been good, the revenue of the Post Office has shown a certain want of elasticity. Still there has been a considerable increase on the year's receipts. The gross increase has been £350,000, but the department anticipated about £250,000 more; and for the coming year we estimate an increase of £430,000 over the past year. The absence of the usual elasticity is due to various causes. Some hon. Members may think it due to the advent of a Liberal Government and the presence of an incompetent Postmaster-General. I admit both premisses, but I do not think either of them contributed to the result. Whatever may be the case, the business of the Post Office has not fallen off from either of these causes. The absence of elasticity is due in the first place to the fact that last year we did not have a General Election, and I do not think many hon. Members will be anxious to bring about a General Election simply in order to increase the receipts of the Post Office. Then, there is no doubt it is largely due to change of taste on the part of the public. Last year there was an abnormal number of picture post-cards purchased by the public. That craze, I am afraid, is to a certain extent diminishing. At one time valentines held the sway; then came the Christmas-card. The former have gradually disappeared, and I can only hope the public will direct its superfluous energy and spare halfpence into another channel equally profitable to the Post Office. In connection with the telegraphs, there is little doubt that the Street Betting Act of last year had also an adverse effect on the revenue. That, however, I for one do not regret. But I am afraid that the chief reason for the falling off in elasticity is the very large increase in the use of the telephone by the public. This is cutting into the only profitable part of the telegraph service, viz., the short distance telegrams in large towns. It is going further than that. Conversation by telephone is largely superseding the use of letters and post-cards. That is a serious matter as affecting what is the sheet anchor of postal revenue—namely, the penny post. In spite of this, the department has endeavoured in the last year to extend the telephone system as far as practicable. Including certain wires which we have laid down in behalf of the National Telephone Company, in view of taking over the lines of that company in 1912, the mileage of wire has been increased by 78,000 miles in the course of the year. A considerable part of that has been telephonic extensions in various parts of Ireland. Both telephone and telegraph lines, I may say, would be more rapidly increased if the Postmaster-General had more adequate powers for dealing with individuals, corporations or other public bodies, which in parts of the country are great obstructers by refusing wayleaves. It not infrequently happens that on the same day I receive communications complaining on the part of some public body that the Post Office are neglecting to extend the telephonic system in their area, the same post brings an absolute refusal of the ordinary wayleave from the corporation itself. In spite of this, however, the wires have been considerably extended.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Has not the revenue for the telephonic system shown an increase?

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Yes, and that is the only satisfactory point. It is at last, taken as a whole, on a paying basis. But at the same time we are losing on the telegraphs. In regard to the general position of wireless telegraphy, the question of the ratification of the Radio-Telegraphic Convention is now before a Select Commtitee of this House. The Post Office has naturally, therefore, held its hands to a certain extent in issuing licences; but I have been able, nevertheless, to issue licences to various British companies during the year. For the coming year the expenditure is estimated to be larger than the normal owing to increased services, and, of course, there is a certain cloud over the expenditure of the coming year pending the report of the Select Committee on the wages of postal servants.

That leads me to the point of how far under present circumstances I was entitled to press the Chancellor of the Exchequer for a greater grant than he has already given for the improvement of the postal service. I have always held that the balance of Post Office revenue ought to be expended, in part, in the interests of what I may call the postal consumer. That policy I have been able to carry out since I came into office. In that connection I do not think the public have any cause of complaint against the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I did not feel I could approach him as strongly this year as I did last year, when he described me as one of the most sturdy beggars among his colleagues. But if I have not been so fortunate this year it is not because I have given up hope; it is rather that I am biding my time and may make an even greater demand another year. I must point out, moreover, in taking the two years together, that he has given me no less a sum than £350,000 a year. Last year my right hon. friend placed at my disposal in order to make postal improvements the sum of £156,000. This was for home reforms. Then there is an additional sum of £200,000 this year, which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has allowed me to take into the Postal Union, to be devoted to the reduction of foreign postage. That is a substantial sum to be taken into account.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: What are the reforms to be?

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: If the hon. Member had been a little more patient he would have seen that I was about to give some details. The substantial result of the reform is that a reduction is made in the charge for the lower denomination of postal orders, and in the higher denominations of the parcel post a very considerable reduction is made. Then the guarantee for a telephone or telegraph is reduced from a half to a third, and I am glad to know that great advantage has been taken of that concession. Another concession, it may interest the Committee to recollect, was that there should be, if possible, a delivery on three days a week in every part of the kingdom, however remote. In the last few months the department has increased the deliveries to three times a week in a very large number of places, involving not less than one million letters a year, and thus the acceleration of letters in the rural districts will be increased. The Postal Union reforms are twofold. In the first place it has been often thought that it would be an advantage if people writing to this country might be enabled to include the cost of the reply. The Department has been able to secure that reform by means of an international coupon which can be enclosed in the letter. But we have been unable to induce the other great countries to agree to a substantial reduction in the 2½d. rate for letters. Their finances did not admit of a reduction being granted or, at all events, they would not agree to the suggestion of a 1d. or 2d. But the British delegates have obtained almost an equivalent. At present a letter sent abroad must not weigh more than half an ounce for 2½d. This weight is now raised to an ounce, and the charge of 2½d. will cover it, instead of the former charge of 5d. A letter weighing 2oz., instead of costing 10d., will now cost 4d., and a letter of 3oz., instead of costing 1s. 3d., will now be carried for 5½d.

*MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): What percentage of the letters were over half an ounce in weight?

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I am afraid I have not the figures.

*MR. HENNIKER HEATON: Was it not only one in a thousand?

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: That is not the point. One of the objects in view in these suggested reforms was that correspondents should not have to consider every half-sheet of notepaper they put into a letter, but that they should enjoy the same freedom to post their letters abroad as they enjoyed under their domestic postage system.

The principal reforms carried out and coming into operation this year include a substantial reduction on the postage of newspapers, magazines, and trade journals to and from Canada. This reform has, I am glad to say, met with very great approval on the part of the Canadian Government, and I think that it has given great satisfaction at home. I have also been enabled to reduce the postage on literature for the blind, and practically to put these afflicted people on the same level as those who still enjoy the use of their sight. The Braille system involves heavy type for each book, and my object has been to treat the volumes of literature for the blind as advantageously in point of cheapness as those for the use of readers with their sight. There is also a small reform for the comfort and convenience of the public desiring to communicate with India and elsewhere. Anyone can telegraph to an English port or to Brindisi, and the telegram will be sent out by the steamer from that port to India or elsewhere. I am also experimenting with stamp machines, so that by means of putting a penny in the slot in these machines at the stations the public may obtain a stamp. The system is not yet complete, but up to the present the experiment has been very profitable, because when the pennies are put in the slot the stamp is not always forthcoming. These are the machines I for one rather approve; but on the other hand, I am sorry to say, there has been a machine in use which suddenly dispensed 3s. 6d. worth of penny stamps before anyone put a penny in at all. Among the other questions which have engaged my attention are the charges and the facilities now in existence between France and the Continent generally and England as to telegraph lines and telephone service. I hope before long to be able to reduce the charge affecting the public service in this matter, and at the same time to add greater facilities. Another subject that has engaged my attention is how best to treat the lottery circulars which are poured with so much profusion into this country. It ought to be clearly understood, however, that it is neither expedient nor right for the Postmaster-General on his own initiative, whatever may be his suspicions, to open a letter which is gummed and closed, and about whose contents there can be no knowledge obtainable without opening it. Circulars that are open, on the other hand, are examined and destroyed when they are found to relate to lotteries or other matters of an undesirable character. In the case of sealed letters of this description, if attention is drawn to them, the Department always refers the question to the police, so that, if possible, they may immediately take proceedings against the authors. I think it is obvious from from a communication I have received that I have been able to take some effectual steps in checking the abuse. A correspondent paid me what I consider to be the greatest compliment I have received in my administrative life by writing me a letter which begun thus—

> "Mr. S. Buxton,—It is with the greatest contempt that I address you, knowing you to be a person of a thieving, mean, and despicable nature, and to have the fact impressed upon me by the circumstances that we have such a man to hold the office of Postmaster-General absolutely makes me feel inclined, after the manner of hundreds more, to turn against the British race altogether."

That letter is from one of the circulators of these lottery tickets. I have appointed a Committee to inquire into the question how far the Post Office can be utilised for assisting small employers to insure against risks under the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Committee is presided over by Lord Farrer, and I hope that the Report will be soon forthcoming.

It is often believed by hon. Members and others that there is undue delay in carrying out inquiries into or promises to increase postal facilities. But the solution of these questions is not so simple as is generally believed. During the past year the Department has been enabled to spend £200,000 on the extension of the underground telegraph system throughout the country. On this particular item there has now been an expenditure of £1,250,000, and the authorities desire in the coming year to increase these facilities as far as possible. It is easy to suggest reforms, but every suggested reform costs money, and it is not always the crass stupidity and obstinacy of the Department which causes it to decline to carry out particular reforms in a particular space of time. Sometimes what is believed to be a step in advance in the matter of postal reform, is in reality a retrograde movement. It is absolutely essential in a large service such as the Post Office to secure uniformity and simplicity, and, though each suggestion of improvement might confer an advantage in one quarter, it might also cause delay, confusion, and disappointment in other quarters.

I have dealt so far with the administration of the Post Office as regards the public. I now come to the other side. The Postmaster-General is by far the largest employer of labour in the United Kingdom. He has under him in the Department 200,000 persons one way and another, of whom 50,000 are women. This is a question which has given me a great deal of anxiety, and it is one to which I have given my best possible attention. I have always said, and I think the Committee will bear me out in saying so—I have always said publicly that the Government, speaking for any Government, ought as an employer of labour to set a good example to other employers; but at the same time we do not want to set up in our public services a privileged class. We want to consider the interests of the taxpayers as well, and while the Government ought to be a good employer of labour, in my opinion, it ought not to be a lavish employer of labour at the expense of the taxpayers. There are different classes of labour for which the Department is responsible, namely, those working for the Post Office under contractors, the mechanic or engineering class; and, of course, the postal employees themselves. As to the class under contractors, I found out after I came into office that I had hardly any control whatever over the conditions of employment, and one of the first things I was enabled to do with the consent of the Treasury was to appoint an inspector to examine and report in regard to the conditions of labour under the various contractors to the Post office, so that for the first time the Postmaster-General might have personal knowledge and personal control over these conditions. Having a parental interest in the Fair Wages Resolution, I have endeavoured to see that it is carried out, so far as it can be, fairly and properly. We have had a Departmental Committee appointed, and I hope it will work out some scheme for the better, the more efficient, and the more uniform working of the service. The fair wages clause is a very important one in Government contracts. I have introduced into every new contract additional clauses as to the wages to be paid, etc., all of which will I hope tend to the improvement of the conditions of those working under contractors. But in regard to this matter you cannot go with a great leap at once. The matter must be dealt with gradually, and improved conditions must come year by year. One of the great difficulties in connection with this question is that of ascertaining what is the recognised fair rate of wages in any particular industry.

I have experienced this difficulty lately in regard to carmen's wages. There is no recognised rate of wages in that particular trade, but it was obvious to me that the men were underpaid and overworked. After some communications on the subject, what I have been enabled to do is to go to the contractors and say—"I do not say that at the present moment there is a recognised rate, but I am going to say what I think you ought to pay, and what I consider a fair rate of wages in the trade." I am bound to say that the contractors met me in a fair spirit, and I think the arrangement come to has given satisfaction to the persons in the employment of the contractors. The wages for single horse men is 25s. a week, and for two horse men 27s. a week. In addition to that they both get a complete uniform which represents 1s. 3d. a week.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton): Does that apply to the provinces as well as to London?

*MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: No, it applies to London. As to the provinces I am still in correspondence. I think my hon. friend has drawn my attention to one or two cases in which the men have been underpaid. I am very glad that the cases have been brought to my attention. These were cases in which the wages appeared to be unduly low, and I shall have the matter inquired into at the earliest possible opportunity. The same remarks apply to the clothing contracts, but unfortunately in regard to these it is not easy to act at once. The contracts had in some instances been entered into before I really had sufficient time to study the question. In regard to all these matters we are hampered by existing contracts, and for some time to come that will be so in many cases. There again it seems to me that it is not right to accept necessarily the lowest tender. It seems to me that the contracts should be spread over a large area so that one could get experience of the way in which the various employees are paid, and further that when new contracts are given out there will be a better chance of choosing between the good and the sweating employers. I think something can be done by spreading the contracts over a large area, and by being by no means tied down to taking the lowest offer. Then as regards employment at the Post Office factory at Holloway, I told the Committee last year that I had endeavoured, as far as possible, to average the work over the year, that is to say, to arrange, as far as possible, the work of thos eemployed in the factory so as to spread it evenly over the year, and thereby prevent the necessity of discharging a large number of men at one time and taking them on at another. The carrying out of that policy has taken some time, but I think it has now been placed on a basis which will obviate the system of employing a minimum of men at one time and adding largely to the number of temporary hands at another. There is a matter in connection with the factory which I think will interest the Committee. There has been instituted at the factory a system which I understand is in operation at a considerable number of private establishments. It is what is called the "suggestion system." That is to say, any workman employed there may make suggestions as to the design of tools, the improvement of machines, or the methods of manufacture, the saving of material, and the prevention of accidents. They are encouraged to make their suggestions by rewards given to them when they propose anything of a practical character, and I am glad to know that in eleven months no less than 108 rewards, averaging from 5s. to £5, have been given to various workmen under the Post Office for suggestions of that nature. I think that everybody will agree that that is a good thing to do. It will interest the men in their work, encourage them to make suggestions, and to have confidence that, if the suggestions should be carried out, they will be rewarded. Therefore it is a scheme which merits the attention of the Committee.

As to the enormous number of men engaged in the actual postal work and the claims they have put forward for improved conditions, their case is now before a Parliamentary Committee. That is in accordance with what they themselves desired, and it is not for me to anticipate—for I have no knowledge whatever—what may be the conclusion at which the Committee will arrive. This, I think, I may say, however, that as the men themselves desired a Parliamentary Committee, which I thought they were entitled to have, I presume, now that they have appealed to Cæsar, they will be prepared to accept the verdict which Cæsar may give. In regard to sanitary improvements, medical services, Home Office inspection, and other matters of that sort, alterations have been made which we hope will improve the conditions of the service. We have been endeavouring as far as we can to limit the over-pressure in the summer season, and the excessive overtime to which that often leads. Unfortunately, while in the summer time the work increases, the staff at that time is at a minimum, owing to the holidays which are granted at the best season of the year. We have endeavoured, as far as possible, to deal with that situation, and while it is necessary to employ a certain amount of temporary labour, we have endeavoured in other ways, and by other means, to diminish the over-pressure and the overtime during the summer season.

There is another matter to which the Committee will allow me to refer, for I know that it is one in which a good many Members take an interest. That is what I may call the blot on the escutcheon of the Post Office, namely, the position of the boy messengers. We have to part with a very large number of these boys at the age of sixteen. I may say that we part with them at that age because we believe that if their services are to be dispensed with at all, it is better for them to go then rather than at eighteen or nineteen years of age. The position of the matter is this. It is a matter over which I have no control. It is due to an arrangement of some years standing between the Post Office, the War Office, and the Admiralty, under which—and I think very legitimately—ex-soldiers and ex-blue-jackets of good character, on leaving the Army and the Navy, should be received into the service of the Post Office. These men were accepted if there was nothing serious in their record against them in order to prevent their going on the streets. The arrangement was that one-half of the postmen's places should be given to ex-soldiers and ex-sailors and the other half to the boy messengers. I confess that it has distressed me very much to receive communications from many parents and others on behalf of those boys whose services have to be dispensed with at sixteen years of age. It is useless to say to the parents that when the boys came into the service of the Post Office at thirteen or fourteen years of age they were informed that it was not a permanent service, and that they had signed a paper to that effect. Every parent, of course, thinks his own child is the best, and that he will certainly succeed, and the parents cannot be persuaded that they have not to a certain extent been taken in when they are asked to take the boys away from the Post Office service. We have given as much time as possible to the consideration of this question with the view of limiting the severity of the treatment of these boys, and I think that we have with some success met the problem. I have now come to an arrangement with the War Office under which, while declining to take a single ex-soldier more into the service, or to place further posts at their disposal to the displacement of the boy messengers, there is to be greater elasticity. In future instead of the ex-soldiers being as now entitled to certain places, I have full freedom to distribute them as fairly as I can among the various branches of the service. Representations were at once made to me that, in adopting this course, we were injuring the interests of the telegraphists or of the learners who would become telegraphists, and that we were endeavouring to introduce these men in order to reduce wages, and so forth. I can hardly believe that those who made these assertions really made them in good faith. It is quite well known that the effect of introducing these men into these positions is to create vacancies for boy messengers, and that not a single person in the service can possibly suffer from the intrusion of these ex-soldiers. They will be taken on the establishment when they have had a certain amount of training, at the same rate of wages and on the same conditions as the present telegrapists. There is no question of introducing cheap labour or anything of that sort. We are doing what we can to direct the attention of employers and others to the boy messengers, and, I am glad to say, in some cases very successfully. It depends very largely on the energy and enterprise of the postmaster, and I should like to pick out particularly the postmaster of Derby, who has been most successful in finding places for these boys, many of whom have been enabled, by the admirable training he has given them, to obtain places on their own initiative. At one time there was some prejudice against these boys. They were not, perhaps, as smart as they might be, but having seen a good deal of the article, I beg to recommend it as a first-class article.

Last year I told the Committee that I fully recognised the Post Office associations as trade unions, with a right of combination and of respresentation through the representatives of different classes. I have nothing to regret in having done so. I think it is the right thing to do, and I believe it has been a satisfactory step. Indeed, I have gone further lately, and have drawn up fresh regulations in consultation with the associations themselves in order to carry out smoother working in regard to this matter. It has been my strong and earnest desire throughout to bring about better relations between the various classes of the postal service, and to bring them, as far as I can, into personal relations with the heads of the Department, because I am a great believer in personal relations as a means of smoothing over difficulties and removing antagonisms. I think these associations and those they represent were inclined to be over suspicious in regard to the Department. They profess to think that the Department was actuated by sinister motives. I am quite certain that the desire of all those who represent the Department is to do their best and the greatest possible justice to the staff as a whole.

The Postmaster-General's position is not an easy task. He has to bear the fierce light of publicity. There are upon him the eyes of some 40,000,000 of population, the eyes of 670 Members of Parliament, all of whom have constituents with eyes upon them, and there are also something like 150,000 watchful and critical employees. Nor is it a light task, because his relations with such a large army of employees must necessarily lead, not only to the larger questions to which I have referred, but also to personal matters, all of which are difficult and take time, and many of which are very painful, though some are amusing. I can only express my indebtedness to hon. Members who write to me, or button-hole me, or question me, for the very conciliatory way in which they treat me in regard to these matters. The service is a great one. I believe—nay, I am sure—that it is actuated from the top to the bottom, with very few exceptions, by real zeal and interest in the work of the Department. I have had many opportunities during the last year of meeting all classes and all ranks of Post Office servants, and I have been very much struck by the public zeal which actuates this great service, and which, I think, is appreciated by the public. I have endeavoured during the time I have been at the Post Office to make advances in every direction. I have done something, or have, at least, endeavoured to do something, for the comfort and convenience of the public, and I have endeavoured, as far as I could, to improve the conditions of those working in the Post Office and to bring about a better understanding and more cordial relations.

*MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury) said he would endeavour to present a picture of the Department from the public point of view. The revenue of the Post Office and Telegraphs Department was £22,000,000, and the expenditure was £17,600,000. The profits of the British Post Office amounted to £4,600,000, exactly £1,000,000 sterling over the amount they were ten years ago, although the expenditure had increased to a large extent. The predecessors of the right hon. Gentleman had sought, in the interests of the public, to limit the amount of the profits which should go into the Treasury. It was held that the Post Office ought not to make profits, and the proposal was made that all above the present profits should go towards extending, cheapening, and facilitating postal communications. He recommended that suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman, who had been going about the country thanking the Chancellor of the Exchequer for having given back to him but a small proportion of the enormous profits which had been made by the Department. His right hon. friend had made a speech which put him in considerable difficulty. Last year the right hon. Gentleman employed 195,000 or nearly 200,000 people, which was 50,000 more than ten years ago. In five years 250,000 people would be employed in the Post Office service, and no doubt, they would be continually making demands upon the Postmaster-General. He would suggest to him a system which would put an end to those calls upon his time and attention. The suggestion was that there should be appointed a Public Service Board similar to that which had been established in Australia. The board there consisted of three able men free from political influences, irremovable by Government, who dealt with all questions in relation to wages and emoluments paid in the various public services, and their decisions gave general satisfaction. Such a body dealing with the complaints of Post Office employees would relieve the Department and Members from much annoyance and from what might become a source of danger to the public service. In an inquiry for establishing such a board the right hon. Gentleman would have every assistance from the Opposition side of the House. From a study of post offices in various parts of the world for the last twenty years, he could say that the British Post Office was one of the best in the world, but it had a number of faults which no business mind could tolerate. The Postmaster-General was armed with full authority against the public and had no responsibility for the defalcations and errors of his servants. No private person conducting such a business would be allowed such irresponsibility, and he suggested that the powers and authority of the Postmaster-General needed revision. The right hon. Gentleman had obtained a cheer by his reference to the reduced postage to Canada. Under the new system a pamphlet weighing a pound could be sent to Canada, 6,000 miles away, for 1d., a wonderful concession for which they were thankful; but then to send a pamphlet or magazine to the Reform Club half a mile off would cost 4d. The arrangement with Canada, moreover, was mean to an extraordinary degree, and one which could not long be tolerated. When he worked hard for postage reduction he did not bargain for a system by which magazines could be sent to Canada for ½d. each while those sent across the road would cost 3½d. in postage. By the new arrangement Canada was made to pay two-thirds of the postage. It was an astonishing arrangement, and would excite laughter here though perhaps not in Canada. The Canadian people were our most loyal people and they were grateful for improved means of communication, but to make them pay two-thirds of the cost of the reduction in postage of our magazines was ridiculous. He was surprised to find that the Postmaster-General made no reference to the inconsistencies of foreign postal rates. From Dover to Calais the postage of a letter was 2½d., but that letter could be sent to Fiji, 12,000 miles, for 1d. A letter could be sent to New York for 2½d., but through the United States to Vancouver, 6,000 miles, it could be sent for 1d. Stronger efforts should be made to remove such anomalies. He appealed to the Postmaster-General to begin a universal penny postage with the United States, where there were probably more British-born subjects of the King than in his distant dominions elsewhere. These people sent £1,600,000 in small postal orders to this country in the course of the year, and the establishment of a penny postage would be hailed with satisfaction by the English-speaking world. In the telegraph system reforms were required. From this country to France the rate was 2d. a word, but in France, as in England, it was ½d. a word. Why did we shout for *entente cordiale* and charge France for a telegraph from Dover to Calais four times as much as we charged for a message from Dover to Ireland? It was astonishing, to people who had considered the question, that postal reforms had been carried in the teeth of Post Office opposition, and one reason he found in the fact that, though the Department was conducted by men of high honour and ability, it had not had a business man at its head since the time of Henry Fawcett—not a man who took into his councils the business men of the country. In France a consultative committee of business men were always sitting with the head of the Department to consider what was best for the general convenience, and he commended the appointment of such a Committee to the right hon. Gentleman, together with the establishment of a Government printing office. In Australia and in the United States post office and other printing was done in Government offices with saving of public money and many other advantages. There were many other matters worthy of attention, but he would content himself with saying that never was there more need for an Imperial

Postmaster-General who would consult with our Colonies and dependencies, and with foreign countries, upon the question of telegraph communication. The public scarcely realised the importance of this subject, and the opportunities there were for economy in expenditure. An amount of something like £4,000,000 sterling was spent in telegraphing in the year. To the Cape the expenditure was £500,000. In telegraphing to Australia we spent more than £1,000 a day, to India and the East almost the same sum, and to the United States £1,000,000 a year.

*MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs) said he was astonished that the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down should have indulged in the criticisms he had on the actions of the Postmaster-General when he was perfectly well aware that that of which he complained did not depend on the action of his right hon. friend, but on the action of the Governments of the respective countries concerned. The public owed a great debt of gratitude to the Postmaster-General for what he had done in the way of reductions.

*MR. HENNIKER HEATON: What reductions?

*MR. ANNAN BRYCE: In the increase in the weights from ½ ounce to 1 ounce, and the reduction of the postage on weights above 1 ounce, which would make an enormous difference to the countries within the postal union. Any criticisms which he might have to make of the actions of the right hon. Gentleman in connection with the Motion he proposed to move he made with great reluctance, because everyone knew the interest the right hon. Gentleman took in the details of his Department and would be convinced of his interest both in its financial condition and in the position of the staff. He had recommended himself to everybody in the House by the consideration with which he met the suggestions made to him, and there was no doubt that since he came into office there had been much better feeling throughout the country in regard to the Department. He himself had to thank the right hon. Gentleman for the way in which he had dealt with a complaint in regard to a matter in his own constituency. The right hon. Gentleman's action in that case would meet with the gratitude of the staff in that constituency. He proposed to move to reduce the right hon. Gentleman's salary by £100 purely with the view of calling attention to a matter of great interest to Scotland. About two months ago a very influential and important deputation waited on the Postmaster-General with regard to underground telegraphic communication with Scotland, and the answer given by the right hon. Gentleman to that deputation was not altogether satisfactory. The right hon. Gentleman showed great knowledge of the subject and great sympathy with the deputation, but explained that unhappily from his financial position he was not able to gratify to the extent he desired the wishes of the deputation with regard to the extension of underground telegraphs. It was well known that, owing to the overhead communications only, telegraphic communication in Scotland was liable to be interrupted during the winter, and last winter there was a very long and serious interruption. The Postmaster-General, although he was aware of this, was able to proceed only very slowly in the conversion of the present overhead into an underground system. The right hon. Gentleman said he would this year be able to complete only the communication to Edinburgh, and although the necessity of communication to Dundee and Aberdeen was very urgent indeed, owing to the slowness of the work it would be many years before they would see safe underground communication between those towns and the rest of the North of Scotland with the South. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Annan Bryce*).

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said the hon. Gentleman who had moved the reduction had no doubt good grounds from the point of view of Scotland obtaining underground in place of overhead communication, which it was evident the climate there rendered more necessary than in England. At the same time he could not help feeling that the cost fell on the United Kingdom as a whole; therefore, he did not think the Postmaster-General could press on this reform quicker than he had. The right hon. Gentleman had made a very clear statement on the various subjects in which he had interested himself since he had been in office, but there were some subjects upon which he did not agree with him. The right hon. Gentleman had devoted a considerable portion of his speech to the question of the boys, and he would be inclined to vote for the Amendment because the statement in that respect was unsatisfactory. The right hon. Gentleman had said they were placed in a hard position, and that that was owing to the arrangements made with the War Office and the Admiralty that a certain number of time-expired soldiers and sailors had to be taken into the Post Office every year. The right hon. Gentleman had used a rather unfortunate phrase. He had spoken about the "intrusion" of soldiers and sailors into the Post Office.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he did not mean it in an offensive manner, but he quite admitted that it was perhaps not a proper expression to use.

SIR F. BANBURY said he would not refer further to that point, and he was glad he had given the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of putting it right. The right hon. Gentleman had said that these boys were badly treated because, though their parents were told when they were engaged that the employment would be only of a temporary character, and though the House was told that these boys had signed an agreement in which they acknowledged they knew of this fact, yet, when the period arrived at which their employment was to cease they considered they had a grievance. He could not conceive how a business man for a moment could consider that when a man had signed an agreement, and carried out the terms of that agreement and completed his bargain, he had a grievance because he had to leave. The right hon. Gentleman had further said he would take care that no further soldiers or sailors were employed in the Post Office. That surely was a very unfortunate conclusion to arrive at. He suggested that if the parents of these boys felt aggrieved that their boys were being discharged from the Post Office, the simplest thing for them to do would be to send them into the Army. Then when they had had a good training and were well disciplined, they could return to the Post Office. There could be no grievance then. If such an arrangement could be arrived at a great incentive would be given to recruiting which was held to be highly desirable by many in the country. He would like to know what objection the right hon. Gentleman had to such a scheme, which he thought would meet a crying want of the men who had served their country, that they should have a claim to serve their country in a civil capacity. The right hon. Gentleman had also announced that the Post Office intended to alter the custom which had previously existed of accepting the lowest tender. The Post Office had a number of contractors on the list, and it would hardly be fair to ask them to send in their tenders and then not to accept the lowest. It was quite a different matter if they advertised for tenders, because people whom they knew nothing about might tender, but where they had a list of contractors, it was to be assumed that their names would not appear upon it unless it was known that they were satisfactory people. Where there was such a list of contractors, it seemed to him that it was only fair that the lowest tender should be accepted. He believed that principle was acted upon in all large departments and concerns in the country. The right hon. Gentleman, in answer to a Question of his, had stated that he estimated that he would get £450,000 increased revenue this year. The net increase of expenditure came to £621,000. The result was, supposing the estimate of £450,000 increased revenue was realised, there would be a deficiency of £170,000. That was rather a serious fact. The right hon. Gentleman had already alluded to the want of elasticity in the Post Office revenue, which, it must not be forgotten, was one of the great items of the revenue producing Departments, and any decrease in the revenue of the Post Office must mean an increase of taxation in some form; therefore it was most important that the net revenue of the Post Office should be kept up. The increase, as far as he could see, was almost entirely in the direction of wages. That was a very serious thing, when one bore in mind that there was, at the present moment, a Committee sitting on that subject. It seemed to him that it would have been better if the right hon. Gentleman had waited until the Committee had reported before he made any alteration in wages. In regard to superannuation and other non-effective charges, he saw that superannuation came to a very large amount, £555,000, and that it had increased very largely in the year, he thought by something like £50,000. On page 136 of the Estimates, he found that a letter carrier, aged twenty-three years, who had been six years in the Metropolitan Police, had been granted a pension. If the man had been six years in the police, it meant that he had joined the force when he was seventeen years of age. Why should this man receive a pension at the age of twenty-three? Another man called Eden, aged forty-seven, had a pension of £104 10s. a year, "because of his inability to discharge efficiently the duties of his office." He would like to know what that meant. On the next page there was the record of a man aged forty-eight, who received £206 a year pension, and there again the reason was inability to discharge efficiently the duties of his office.

*The CHAIRMAN said the reduction which had been moved was on the right hon. Gentleman's salary, and it was open to discuss questions of policy, but not details which would really arise better on other items.

Sir F. BANBURY said the right hon. Gentleman was in charge of the Vote and he desired to have particulars of these pensions, the conferring of which would be under his control, and if he received a satisfactory answer he certainly did not want to vote for the reduction of the right hon. Gentleman's salary.

*Mr. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) said he had received a complaint of rather a serious kind from Grangemouth, an important seaport in his constituency, the third in importance, as an export centre, in Scotland and the link between Glasgow on the West and the Eastern export and import trade. It had only reached him that morning, together with a sheaf of other complaints. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman why it was that the Post Office trunk exchange had been removed from Grangemouth to Falkirk. At Grangemouth a very large volume of business was being done, and this removal of the trunk exchange had very seriously dislocated business. The merchants had suffered very great delays, and he wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman would consent to restore the original arrangement by which the trunk exchange was located at Grangemouth, and also to accelerate the telephone service between Grangemouth, which was the eastern seaport of Glasgow, and Glasgow itself which financed the trade. The report he had received that morning was that the Grangemouth traders would not be content unless either they received a direct trunk service between Grangemouth and Glasgow, or a sufficient number of wires were placed solely at the disposal of the Grangemouth and Glasgow community in regard to Grangemouth business. He would accentuate the claim they now made, by stating that the trade of Grangemouth, under the old arrangement, was very much facilitated. It was mainly with the Baltic States, Norway and Sweden, and was chiefly in timber and iron inwards and coal outwards, and the result of the dislocation of the telephone arrangements had been seriously to impede that trade. There had been considerable difficulty recently in conducting the important business with the Baltic provinces and the inconveniences were being felt more and more daily. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give him an assurance that the trunk telephone exchange would be restored to Grangemouth, or at least that an equally rapid and efficient service would be provided at an early date. If he received that assurance he would not vote for the reduction of the salary of his right hon. friend, but otherwise he would be obliged to do so. Another subject to which he wished to call attention was the serious complaints of traders that deliveries were irregular and not sufficiently numerous. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would pay attention to those complaints.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said he cordially supported his hon. friend's proposal. He did not know that he could congratulate the Postmaster-General so cordially upon the support he was receiving from the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London, who evidently thought that the chief object of Imperial revenue was that it should be spent in London or its immediate vicinity. Telegraphic communications in Scotland seemed to be looked upon with perfect indifference by the hon. Baronet, but they were, nevertheless, of some importance to the industrial communities on the East Coast of Scotland. The North of England towns had been well linked up with the underground telegraphic system, and it was a matter of congratulation that Glasgow had been joined up. The slowness of the means adopted to link up Edinburgh with the underground telegraphic system fully deserved the criticisms which had been made upon it, because the delay was intolerable. The climate of Scotland was a good deal worse than the climate of England in regard to the subject they were discussing. It was the snow falling in a certain condition which clung to the wires and broke them down, and Scotland had to suffer in that way. From the point of view of the business community this matter was urgent. It was not only Edinburgh but the great commercial districts of Fife, Dundee, and Aberdeen which were concerned, because they were all cut off sometimes for days from the rest of the world by the breaking down of telegraphic communication. It was always possible for England and Ireland to get a million or so for anything of importance, and it was not right that Scotland should be starved in this way year after year. The limit of their patience had now been reached on this matter. They were not urging a retrograde policy, and he trusted the right hon. Gentleman would bring the telegraphic communications with Scotland up to the same level as the rest of the work over which he presided.

SIR GILBERT PARKER hoped it was not too late to congratulate the right hon. Gentleman upon the improvement she had made in the means of communication between this country and Canada in regard to the postal service. He felt that the right hon. Gentleman deserved the greatest credit in this matter, because previous Postmasters-General had always adopted an adamantine attitude towards the efforts other Members and himself had made to reduce the postage rate to Canada, the excuse being that it would involve an immense loss to the Postal Department. He was glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman state that he did not think there would be any great loss on account of this concession. He strongly held that the Postal Department ought not to be considered the milch cow that it was; the amount of money paid over to the Chancellor of the Exchequer was out of all reason. The reason they had not had proper reforms in the past except at the point of the bayonet was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer demanded every year £3,000,000 or £4,000,000 from the Department. His hon. friend had spoken of the typists employed at 18s. a week in the General Post Office. Three years ago the hon. Member for Canterbury and others on both sides of the House urged that such a salary was absolutely inadequate. Anyone who knew what it cost to live in London knew that 18s. a week would not supply any girl with a decent living. She must live with her parents or be a burden upon her relatives, and she had to face actual starvation or temptations to something much worse. The right hon. Gentleman handed over £4,000,000 a year of profits to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and yet he declined to give these typists an increase in their wages.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I do not decline.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said he was glad to hear that statement from the right hon. Gentleman, because they had been for a long time urging that the Postmaster-General should give better wages to the female workers. The difference between the male and the female workers in regard to wages was very great. It had been urged by the hon. Member for Canterbury that the only way to get a proper and efficient service and proper pay well balanced was not by the efforts of trade unions and associations, but by the boards which he had suggested. Labour Members knew that, because whilst they were able by their unions to gain advantages for one particular section of post office employees they did not gain them for another section. The difficulties attaching to this matter of salaries was one that should not be borne by the Postmaster-General. The pressure that used to be brought upon Members of the House had not been so much exercised since the attempt had been made to bring the associations into closer relation with the Department itself, but in the past attempts at pressure had been made which practically amounted to blackmail, and they had made some hon. Members who had supported the cause of the employees extremely angry. Whilst such Members had voted for all just claims they had opposed and resented the attempts made to compel them to intervene in regard to these matters. He honestly thought we should never have a really first-class postal service with all the improvements due to them until Pariament had reduced the amount which the Department paid over to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and had relieved the Postmaster-General of the duty of acting as the final judge and arbiter in the case of salaries. When that had been done they would arrive at a condition of things which would make the Post Office the best Department in the world. Our police and postal service was universally acknowledged to be excellent. In every other respect we were in the van of progress and the Postal Department should not lag behind. In regard to the arrangement made with the trade association, difficulties would arise, because they would bring pressure to bear in certain directions to achieve certain reforms only; that would cause rivalry and jealousy in other directions and they would never have any uniform system. The system of dealing with salaries ought to be kept uniform by a board free from all political considerations. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that they had 200,000 employees in the Post Office and 150,000 of them were critics. He supposed the other 50,000 were ladies, and he asked whether the reason the wages of female employees were not raised was that they did not criticise. With regard to the telephone service he had to pay £17 10s. a year and £1 10s. deposit, together with an extra charge of 6d. on his messages for a private telephone. That was out of all proportion to the proper expenditure. The Postmaster-General would say that he could not alter it because it would be impossible to make the telephone service pay. At the beginning of a great service there must be a certain amount of loss. The service had first to be built up before the return could be expected from it which they ought to get. If a certain amount of the money which was given to the Chancellor of the Exchequer were devoted for the time being to the relief of the telephone service he believed the Postmaster-General would get a larger revenue in the end. While the Department was one of which the country might well be proud, it was a Department in which reforms were as necessary now as when his hon. friend the Member for Canterbury commenced his campaign twenty years ago. If the Postmaster-General would throw off the shackles of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in this case, and it could be done—[An Hon. Member: What about about old-age pensions?] If they were depending on this Department for old-age pensions they might get them, but the wages of the people they wished to benefit would not increase in proportion to the cost of living in the country.

Mr. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said he did not rise as a critic of the right hon. Gentleman, but to pay him a personal tribute for the public spirit which he had brought into his great Department. Last year he raised the question of the wages paid to the mail cart drivers, and he was glad to learn that the Postmaster-General had given his attention to it. In some directions he had considerably increased the wages and improved the conditions of the drivers. He wished, if possible, to accelerate the speed and widen the field of the right hon. Gentleman's activity. It was perfectly true that many of the mail drivers in this country were paid scandalous wages. He would personally wish that the Post Office would undertake its own mail van work, and not give it to private contractors, but pending that time, which he hoped was not far distant, he would ask the Postmaster-General whether it was possible for him to make inquiry in the provinces on the lines which he had so successfully followed in the Metropolitan area, in order to find out the wages paid to the mail drivers. He had had several cases brought to his own knowledge where the hours were intolerably long and the wages scandalous, something like 2¼d. per hour. That was the pay of some of the drivers who had to stand all the inclement weather. He asked whether the Postmaster-General could secure a return of the wages and conditions of the men engaged in the mail van service. He was glad to find himself in opposition to the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London. He was beginning to think that it was a virtue to be opposed to anything which the hon. Baronet supported. The hon. Baronet had stated in the course of his remarks that the revenue of the country depended to some extent on the income and the profits of the Post Office. He agreed. But the hon. Baronet went on to say that the Postmaster-General must exercise great care, because he had found that an increase of wages in one direction had arisen owing to an increase in another. He himself believed that that increase had been warranted. It had been granted by the Postmaster-General to some extent to remove a grievance in the Department over which he presided. He would like to call the right hon. Gentleman's attention to another question which might mean another outlay which would approximate more to justice than the present conditions. In Liverpool, in connection with the telegraph office, he was informed on very good authority that there were a large number of temporary clerks employed alongside a number of permanent clerks. There was also a considerable amount of overtime worked by those permanently engaged. Surely by a little arrangement those who were temporarily employed might, at least in some cases, be put on the permanent staff by removing the overtime, and thus avoiding the insecurity of those who were not now on the permanent staff. In the labour world there was nothing more depressing than the feeling of uncertainty, and many of these temporary clerks did not know the length of time they would be occupied in the postal service. He was told that it figured out at about eight months in the year, and that the other four months were a period of uncertainty. It was reasonable to suppose that the four months might mean a period of privation as well. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to exercise his good offices in making an inquiry into this question at Liverpool, so that some of the temporary clerks might be put on the permanent staff. He was glad that his hon. friend had raised the question of the female typists. He did not think there was any man who would support sweating in connection with female labour, and especially the miserable wage paid to the typists. It was impossible for a female to live in London, Liverpool, or other large centre on 18s. a week. She might be living at home, and in that case 18s. contributed to the family exchequer would help the family to live somewhat decently; but if she was compelled, as she sometimes was, under the Post Office conditions, to remove to another office, she might be taken from the home circle to live in London. It was impossible to live on 18s. a week in any of the large cities, and he was sure that the Postmaster-General would be doing a real public service if he gave these females a standard living wage, and reduced the disproportion as regarded pay between males and females. There was not a very great difference in the work they did, and that being so, he thought the Postmaster-General in the interest of justice should bring the salaries into some more even relationship than existed at the present time.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire) said the question of providing underground wires in Scotland was a very serious one. He reminded the Committee that at the end of last year there was a severe snowstorm in the North of Scotland, and that for three days owing to the breakdown of the telegraph wires the city of Aberdeen was shut off from the rest of the world. That was a great calamity. He did not say that it was a calamity for Aberdeen to be shut off from the rest of the world, but it was a serious calamity for the rest of the world to be shut off from Aberdeen. Aberdeen was the second largest centre of the fishing industry in the Kingdom, and that industry was to a large extent dependent on the telegraph. The city was also an important telegraphic centre. It might be said that such a snowstorm would not occur again. He was not sure about that. He believed that the weather went in cycles. It did so in the time of Pharaoh and it might do so again. There might be a cycle of bad winters, and it was very important that something should be done to prevent the interruption of telegraphic communication. The Postmaster-General had been exceedingly kind to Aberdeen. He acknowledged that frankly. The right hon. Gentleman went down there recently and opened a new post office. He believed that Aberdeen intended to get something out of him when he was there, but somehow or other that had fallen through. Whether that was due to the Postmaster-General's charm of manner or to the Highland hospitality with which he was welcomed and the desire not to take advantage of a guest he could not say, but the right hon. Gentleman got away and nothing had been done. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman would plead impecuniosity. That was always the plea of Ministers on these occasions. If he was going to extend the underground wires to Edinburgh, why could he not leave out the connection and begin at Aberdeen, extending the wire southwards? The part of Scotland most likely to be disturbed by storms was the northern part between Aberdeen and Dundee or Edinburgh. He urged that if more money could not be got to extend the lines more rapidly from the south, the work should be done from the north.

*Mr. WILKIE (Dundee) thanked the Postmaster-General for his action in meeting the representatives of the workers' organisations. He did not share the views which had been expressed in some quarters as to the trouble which the right hon. Gentleman would get into in future by simply following the example of most large employers of labour. The fact that the employees knew that they could approach the right hon. Gentleman would tend to do away with a considerable number of complaints. The treatment of the boys who entered the Post Office service had been a great grievance for a considerable time. He did not think the present method was satisfactory. There seemed to be a desire to force the lads into the Army. If the Army was to be recruited it would not be done by this method. These lads were above the average in education, and he thought that other methods should be adopted to secure recruits. As to the suggestion that a "Public Service Board" should be instituted, that would require to be very carefully considered. It was a very large question which would affect the civil servants from the highest to the lowest grade; and it might cut in a way which was not anticipated by the hon. Members who had made it. There was a grievance in regard to the telegraph employees in Dundee; it was an entirely local grievance, and he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to meet the wishes of the telegraphists in that city. There was another matter which he wished to bring before the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the postal rates charged for periodicals, which affected particularly the industrial class. These rates were much higher than those charged for society journals and other papers of a so-called higher class, and certainly for periodicals which were of much greater weight and bulk. He did not know whether that was according to law or not; but, if it was, a small Bill should be introduced to remedy that grievance. Then there was the question affecting his constituency in connection with the underground telegraph wires. A deputation had recently waited on the Postmaster-General. They complained that while the right hon. Gentleman had complied with the demands of Glasgow and Edinburgh he had left such important cities as Dundee and Aberdeen and the whole of the North of Scotland out of account. The deputation had received no satisfaction. Since then he had visited Dundee in reference to the matter, and had had interviews with the representatives of the public and the chamber of commerce and many business men in the city, who were very greatly dissatisfied with the reply which the Postmaster-General had given to the deputation. They thought that the extension of the underground wire to Dundee and the North might be greatly accelerated. In his reply to the deputation, the Postmaster-General stated that a storm such as that which had broken all communication with the North in January last did not often occur. If the right hon. Gentleman could guarantee that such another storm would not occur until he had these lines underground, they would not press him; but the right hon. Gentleman could not give that guarantee, therefore he thought that the business communities of Dundee and Aberdeen should be served at once by underground telegraphic lines so that the whole business of the east coast of Scotland should not be interrupted.

*Mr. WILES (Islington, S.) believed there were from 8,000 to 10,000 men who had served in the Army or Navy who now had an engagement in the postal service. He thought that when these men were taken into the Post Office service they should be allowed to count for pension their seven years service in the Army or Navy. Let them take the case of a young man eighteen years of age——

The DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question of pensions was a matter of legislation and could not be discussed under this Vote.

*Mr. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.) said he desired to draw the attention of the Postmaster-General to three points, namely, the wages of the Post Office employees, the creation of a privileged class of workmen at Mount Pleasant, London, and the question of the wages of the mail drivers. The minimum wage of letter carriers in London was only 20s. per week and rose only to 34s. after long service, so that the conditions of employment did not compare favourably with those in other spheres of industry. It must be remembered that the great bulk of those men were married, and even when they attained to 34s. a week that was hardly enough to keep a man and his family. Last year he had raised the question in respect to the joinery department at Mount Pleasant. The conditions there were such that no trade unionist could apply for work at all unless he cared to drop out of his union. They were just as much entitled to be paid the same rates for employment under the State as those paid to the privileged classes in this Department, and until the conditions of employment were altered there would be great discontent. As to the case of the mail van drivers the hon. Baronet the junior Member for the City had said that on every occasion the lowest tender for the contract should be accepted, but he submitted that that led to sweating. He did not know of any men in private employ who were so badly paid as the mail van drivers, and he supposed that that was because the Post Office Department did accept the lowest tender. The best way would be for the Post Office themselves to undertake the work of the carriage of the mails from the post office to the railway stations and other districts and not by means of contractors. Mention had been made of the creation of a board in Australia to consider all these questions of wages. That Civil Service Board in Australia had worked very beneficially for the employees as well as for the Government. Australia, however, was a new country and this was an old country, and the only means the workers had to bring pressure to get justice for themselves was through the trade unions, and the Postmaster-General had met them in the readiest manner and allowed them to state their case directly through their representatives. Before the question of a Civil Service Board to consider wages was adopted, he would prefer that some longer period of trial should be given the new conditions.

*Mr. STAVELEY-HILL (Staffordshire, Kingswinford) called attention to the condition of the post office at Old Hill, South Staffordshire, and to the method of inspection of post offices generally. The right hon. Gentleman had informed him that he had had this post office inspected having reference to the complaints which had reached him as to the inadequate accommodation it afforded for such a large district. No doubt the inspection had taken place, but he wanted to know the views of the inspector. He was in this post office last Saturday and saw how inadequate the accommodation was, as more than four fully grown people could not stand at the counter at one time. It was true that there were two sub-post offices, but they were such a distance from the main office as to be of very little use. There was no desire on the part of those who had petitioned the Postmaster-General to oust the present postmaster, but they asked that there should be a reconstruction of the building. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would consent to receive a deputation of the inhabitants on the subject.

*Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) said it was perhaps unfortunate that so many subjects should be brought forward on the question of the reduction of the Postmaster-General's salary. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would not take it as a reflection upon himself as it was merely a way of raising those questions. The question of mail drivers had been before them for twenty years, and the right hon. Gentleman said he was not responsible as the work was done under contracts. They had all heard of these contracts and of conditions as to fair wages to the men. Surely the Postmaster-General could see that these conditions were put in the contracts for carrying the mails. He quite agreed with the hon. Member who had spoken previously that the Post Office business ought not to be simply for money making. It ought to be carried on in the interests of the trade and of the social affairs of the United Kingdom. He hoped the Postmaster-General would be able to do something in the direction of a universal penny post, and pointed out that, as far as they knew, the Imperial penny post had not been a loss at all. The present arrangements were perfectly ridiculous. One could send a letter to India and Australia and further still for 1d., but to send one across the Channel from Dover to Calais cost 2½d. One could send a lette across the United States to British Columbia for 1d., but if it was stopped on the way, say at New York, it cost 2½d. In reforming such anomalies as that he knew they would have no trouble with the Postmaster-General if it were not for the permanent officials who hampered and controlled him. [" Oh."] Well, the Duke of Norfolk told the country that his difficulty in carrying out any reform was the power of the permanent officials, and if the present Postmaster-General did better than his predecessors they would be grateful indeed. The difficulty was to make these permanent officials recognise any merit outside their offices and outside themselves. Every reform had been driven into the Department from outside. They opposed in the first instance Rowland Hill's penny postage. He believed the permanent officials hated like poison his hon. friend the Member for Canterbury, but if the Postmaster-General had his own way he thought he would carry out what that hon. Member advocated. The City had recognised the services of his hon. friend by giving him its freedom in the usual gold box, and it was, after all, the City which benefited more by cheap and efficient postal facilities than any other part of the United Kingdom. He hoped the Postmaster-General would overcome the Chancellor of the Exchequer and would not be " bossed " by his permanent officials. The more the right hon. Gentleman depended upon his own ability and knowledge the better it would be for the country in regard to the postal service. If the Postmaster-General alone were concerned he did not think it would be long before we had universal penny postage. He wished to join with his colleagues in impressing upon the Postmaster-General the necessity in regard to the service with Scotland of having the wires placed underground. He supposed he would be told that the right hon. Gentleman had not got the money, but with a post office revenue of £2,405,000 from Scotland and an expenditure of £1,981,000, which showed a profit of between £400,000 and £500,000 per annum, he had no business to use that profit elsewhere until he had put the Scottish telegraph, post, and telephone service in a proper efficient condition. It was no use for the Postmaster-General to say he could not control the weather. It was his business to control it, and that was the reason why the reduction was moved in his salary. He trusted that the application made on behalf of Scotland would not be in vain. His concern was with a district two or three hundred miles further north, where the weather was more stormy, and his reason for having these wires in a proper and safe condition was stronger even than that of others who had spoken. His constituents were 700 miles away and could not come to the House and watch their proceedings, they were dependent on the telegraph to take them the news, and therefore he trusted that not a moment would be lost in putting these matters right. He noticed in the Estimates that about £1,000 a year was spent on telegraph business in regard to race meetings, and he asked why the right hon. Gentleman was spending money on such a vice as racing, the only respectable thing about which was the horse. He further complained that the right hon. Gentleman had not carried out the promises made last year with regard to giving larger facilities, both postal and telegraph, in country districts. With regard to Sutherlandshire, the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech last year made a full statement about telegraphs and telephones and said he would give larger facilities, and that under ordinary circumstances the Postmaster-General should guarantee two-thirds of the annual cost. This telegraphic communication was very important to a place like Sutherlandshire, which had to depend on the telegraph for its markets. Last year he sent in a petition on behalf of the people living at Elphin asking for a telegraph service. The right hon. Gentleman promised to put up a wire and conduct the service if the people of the district guaranteed so much per annum, but refused himself to go on the guarantee promised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer although the Chancellor of the Exchequer had promised that the Postmaster-General should guarantee two-thirds of the loss (if any). With regard to the postal delivery, there were several places in Sutherlandshire which had only one delivery a week, and though the Postmaster-General had made considerable improvement in the postal facilities (for which he thanked him) by giving, in some cases, two deliveries a week, having regard to the promise that there should be a delivery at least three times a week, he contended the right hon. Gentleman had not gone far enough. In one particular case a most extraordinary thing had happened. Up to a few weeks ago the people of a certain district had had a delivery three times a week, and they had now been knocked down to a delivery on the Saturday only. So that the promises of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been in that case reversed. That was a matter he would send in to the Postmaster-General to inquire into. He did not apologise for occupying the time of the Committee; it was the duty of Members of the House of Commons, before they granted supply, to ventilate their grievances and secure reforms. He reminded the Postmaster-General that fourteen months ago the Prime Minister promised to do everything he could to help the people to improve their country. The Prime Minister had on that occasion said that we ought "to colonise our own country." He (Mr. Morton) had forgotten more about colonisation than many hon. Gentlemen ever knew; and he knew that the Canadian and United States Governments considered it their first duty when "colonising" to attend to postal facilities, telegraphs, and telephones. On one occasion when he was in a new settlement in America so anxious were the Canadian Govern- to assure the delivery of mails that they sent them on the back of an Indian, who walked into the settlement on snow shoes. He thought the right hon. Gentleman ought to do everything in his power to carry out the promise of the Prime Minister to help the people to improve their own country and trade. While thanking the Postmaster-General for past favours, he hoped he would attend in the future to the important matters he had mentioned.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he regarded the permanent officials as a hard-working body, who paid close attention to their business, and for regularity and everything else they were unequalled by any other body of public servants; the Postmaster-General would be absolutely useless and incapable without the assistance of the permanent officials, who were acquainted with the work, and it was to them that the Postmaster-General, when he was placed in office, must naturally look. He was always sorry to hear the permanent officials found fault with. They might think, at times, that they were hide-bound and stuck to red-tape, but he did not think for a moment that there ever entered their heads any thought save that which they believed to be entirely for the public good in the way of greater facilities. When he came into the House he was astonished to see his hon. friend the Member for the City of London on his legs and addressing the House, but he found him for once employed on an excellent object, though he confessed he viewed with alarm the prospect he described as to the employment of old soldiers, and he was sure he might venture to say a few words in their behalf. The right hon. Gentleman could not in fact abrogate the arrangement made as to the employment of old soldiers, but he would not increase their number owing to the fact that the parents of the boys thought that they laboured under a grievance. He was very sorry indeed to hear that the right hon. Gentleman did not intend to increase the number of Reservists employed, because it had always been one of the difficulties in the service that men leaving it were not able to find employment, and he thought that a man who had served his country was entitled to greater consideration at the hands of the community than those who had not done so. He had no wish to labour the point, but he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see that in some people's minds at all events the provision of employment for men who had deserved well of their country was a very serious question. Only men who had excellent characters were eligible for this employment, and it was hard that they should have so limited a door slammed in their face. With regard to the female typists in the Post Office, he did not believe that it was possible for a girl in that position to live in London on less than £1 a week, and he thought they should at least be on the watch in her behalf. Had anything been done in respect of the dining arrangements or getting food, except at their own expense or outside of the office? If no arrangements had been made, he thought some ought to be made. He did not think that these girls ever got their meals properly or comfortably. They went out and got an indigestible bun and a glass of milk, not in the least wholesome for them, and they had no time to get their proper food. He trusted that, if it was not already the case, the Postmaster-General would be able to make such arrangements that they could get their food in the office, or in some room adjacent to the office—decent food, well cooked, and with an opportunity to eat it so that their health would not be affected. As regarded the question of the mail drivers, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way, in the interests of man and horse, to supplying motor vans in the place of horse vans where practicable and possible. Another point to which he wished to call attention was the question of change given over the counter to the public. The point was whether, if a five-pound note was tendered at the post office, change could be obtained.

MR. SIDNEY BUXTON: I am inquiring into that.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD said he would not in that case press the matter further, but he would be glad of a reply about the boy messenger service.

MR. SIDNEY BUXTON: That is all arranged.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD said the principal question he had raised was as to the employment of old soldiers, and he hoped it would be seriously considered by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. MACLEAN (Bath) said he would like to join in the commendation of the right hon. Gentleman's policy with regard to the employees in the Post Office service. They found, as a result of it, that instead of a state of agitation, they had now something approaching content. With regard to one or two remarks which had been made as to serving the country, he pointed out that there were men who served it as efficiently and faithfully outside the ranks as did those who were in the service; and it was not fair that, where men had been employed for a great number of years in the Post Office, they should not have, rightly and properly, the promotion which was due to them. He wished to draw attention to the inefficient state of the post office in

High Street, Bath. A great amount of injury and inconvenience was caused owing to the lack of public accommodation. High Street was right in the centre of the city, and Bath was constantly full of visitors from all parts of the country and many parts of the world, who wished to send telegrams, or money, or postal letters to great distances. They had to go to a sort of subterranean office which was off the High Street, and great inconvenience was experienced. The matter was one of great importance to the city, and representations had been made over and over again by the chamber of commerce and by the city corporation, expressing the earnest hope that the question would have the consideration which it really needed. One objection with which they were met was that there was not sufficient business done to justify an extension of facilities. He suggested, with all respect to the permanent officials who very largely controlled these matters, that they ought to look at them in a business-like way. A business man, when dealing with a subject of this kind, knew perfectly well that if he wanted an extension of business he ought to extend his premises. He was quite certain that if the authorities properly considered the urgent prayer of the petitions which had been sent up from time to time by the representative bodies of the city with regard to this matter the great public inconvenience complained of would be very speedily remedied.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, who was indistinctly heard, was understood to say that the hon. Member for Canterbury, as well as the hon. Member for Sutherland, had attacked the permanent officials of the Post Office with some virulence. It had been his honour and pleasure to work with the permanent officials at the Post Office for some time. He thought our public service was the highest in the civilised world, and there were no men in that service who were more anxious to do right than the permanent officials of the Post Office. It was their duty, when suggestions were made, either from outside or from the Postmaster-General, to criticise those proposals in order that it might be seen whether they would hold water. He might say frankly that some of his own proposals might have been criticised in the initial stages, but he had welcomed that criticism. If, however, he had made up his mind to do a particular thing, though the officials might not agree with it, no one could give him greater assistance than they did in making it easy for him to carry his plan out. That was, he thought, the greatest compliment to them. A permanent official ought first to criticise, and then, having criticised, to do his best to make the proposal a workable one for the benefit of the public. He had heard with great regret the words of the Members for Canterbury and Sutherlandshire. The hon. Member for Canterbury had compared our Post Office with that of France, which, it was said, always had a business man in connection with it, or at the head of it. All he could say was that he was glad he lived in a country—even if there was no business man in the Post Office—where they had rejoiced in penny postage for sixty-six years, whereas it was only introduced in France last year.

*Mr. HENNIKER HEATON said France had a penny post, but it was raised to pay the expenses of the War. He had the highest opinion of the permanent officials and would not exchange them for any body of civil servants in the world. It was of the head of the Department in France that the had spoken.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said that in reference to female typists, as a matter of fact, they were civil servants, and in that sense he had no control over them. There appeared to have been some mistake in regard to their rate of pay. It was true that these typists were paid 18s. a week during the first year of their service, but they were working upon a scale under which their wages rose to 19s. the next year, and an increase of 2s. a week every succeeding year until their wages reached 25s., and he thought hon. Members would agree with him that that was a very different thing from 18s. per week. He did make representations to the Treasury on receipt of a memorial from these typists, because it seemed to him that their case ought to be considered in order to ascertain whether their wages were or were not adequate. With regard to postal improvements, some hon. Members had gone so far as to say that the whole of the profits on the postal system ought to be spent upon improvements. He was bound to say that he did not agree with that view. The Post Office had always exercised a double function from the point of view of the revenue: (1) to add something to the Exchequer in relief of taxation elsewhere; and (2) to provide a certain amount to be spent every year in postal improvements. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had allowed a very liberal sum for various improvements by granting £350,000 a year extra out of the revenue of the Post Office, and he considered that that was a very substantial contribution to postal reform. [An Hon. Member: It ought to be double.] The hon. Member who made that interruption could not be aware of the relations of the Treasury in regard to all the great spending departments. They were spending quite enough already, and if they had not the watch-dog of the Treasury to guard their expenditure he did not know what would happen. The hon. Member for Gravesend had alluded to his own private telephone, but it was a very long wire, and that was why he had to pay an additional sum. He had settled the question of London carmen, and any instances where the carmen were not receiving suitable wages and whose hours were unduly long would certainly be inquired into.

Mr. MORTON asked if it was provided in the contract that they should be paid a fair rate of wages?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON replied that every contract contained a fair wages clause giving the right of inspection and general inquiry into the rate of wages.

Mr. MORTON: Then they are breaking the contract if they are not paying fair wages?

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: Yes. The difficulty was that whilst they had a fair wages clause, there was no recognised rate of fair wages. With regard to the telephone system referred to by the hon. Member for Stirlingshire, he had had some communication with the National Telephone Company on the subject, and he would see what could be done to improve the service. The increases which had been referred to by the hon. Member for the City of London were only normal increases in the pay of Post Office servants according to the scale. With regard to the messengers, he felt that it was a real hardship that the boy messengers should come into the service anticipating permanent employment and then have to give up their service. In regard to the clothing contract, complaint had been made that he had not accepted the lowest tender in every case. Hon. Members must be aware that in the clothing trade there was a great deal of sweating, and if the lowest tender was always accepted the result would be that the employees would not receive decent wages. Another reason why he had not accepted the lowest tender in every case was that he had endeavoured to spread the tenders over a considerable number of contractors so that he might obtain some experience as to who were good and who were bad employers. The hon. Member for Sutherlandshire had asked him a question about underground telegraphic wires, but he wished to point out that he had endeavoured to meet the various suggestions he had made. In regard to the extension of telegraph lines in sparsely populated districts such as Sutherlandshire, there must be some discrimination where the capital outlay was out of all proportion to the general advantages of the locality. He entirely appreciated the importance of the matter to which his hon. friend from Scotland had drawn his attention. It was a very serious thing that a town of the size and importance of Aberdeen should be practically cut off from telegraphic communication for two or three days through a snowstorm. The only gratification he felt about the matter was that when the deputators came to see him about it, they admitted that the snowstorm in question was the most severe one for fifty years. He agreed with the hon. Member for Kincardineshire that it was an immense loss to the rest of the United Kingdom to have Aberdeen cut off for two or three days, but if it only happened once in fifty years they would perhaps be able to bear it with equanimity. Some hon. Members had gone further and suggested that he ought to control the weather in Scotland. Since he had been at the Post Office he had had a considerable number of duties imposed upon him, but he confessed that it was rather beyond his power to control the weather in Scotland, and he hoped, if he was unable to do it, he would not be blamed. He found that in the administration of the Post Office he often got praise for things for which he deserved none and got blamed for things for which he was not to blame. He read the other day, for instance, that last Christmas the Christmas parcels were much better packed, and that it was due to the new Postmaster-General. That was undue praise. It would be undue blame to blame him for not controlling the weather in Scotland.

Mr. MORTON: I did not suggest that. I suggested that by the expenditure of a sum of money you could control the weather by putting the wires underground.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said he felt the importance of the matter, but he wanted to point out two or three considerations which he hoped would be appreciated, because they largely affected the question and his power of dealing with it. The system of putting telegraph wires underground was a comparatively new one. It was only in the last few years that they had discovered the paper insulator and that it had been really effective. When it was first done by gutta percha it was ineffective. This meant that there had been delay in carrying out the underground wiring. Only a certain amount of the work could be carried out each year, in the first place because of the expense, and, secondly, because of the difficulty of supervision. Already something like £1,000,000 had been spent, and by the end of this year £1,250,000 would have been spent in underground wires towards the completion of those parts, the trunk and main wires, which were already in hand. When they were completed they would be able to turn their attention to other quarters of the country. It was a costly thing, however, to put in underground wires, and it was not merely a question of the initial cost. A considerable outlay was involved in breakages which occurred from time to time, and the return nothing like covered the interest on the expenditure. Still, it was a thing that ought to be done as a national matter and done as rapidly as possible. What should be done was first to have a complete trunk line from London to Glasgow, and then from it to have spread out spurs in various directions. In the first place they wanted a trunk line down to the south west and south in order to catch the cable connections with the Continent, with India, with the East, and with America, and prevent storms breaking the communications. His hon. friend the Member for Aberdeen had said that it would be a serious thing that Dundee, which was interested in the jute trade, should not be able to communicate with India. That was the strongest argument in favour of completing the underground wires to the south-west, where the Indian cable started, before laying them to Dundee itself. Similar storms occurred in South Wales, and, if there were no underground wires in the south-west, not only Dundee but every other part of the country might be in the position of having their communication with India cut off for an appreciable time, whereas, under existing conditions, Dundee had not been cut off from communication with India. He thought his hon. friends from Scotland were too much inclined to deal with the matter as a local question. It was really not a local question at all. It was far more important to the jute industry of Dundee than to the Devonshire labourers that the underground wires should be extended first to the south-west. The first thing to be done was to bring the underground communication in connection with the cables in various parts of the country, and that was what they had in hand at present. They had in hand a cable to Newcastle, and it was hoped, if not to complete it, at any rate nearly to complete the underground cable from Edinburgh to Glasgow. He was asked by one hon. friend why they did not begin at the Edinburgh end and by another why they did not begin at the Aberdeen end. It was difficult from these suggestions to find out which end to begin first. One reason why they would not be able to complete the underground wire between Edinburgh and Glasgow this year was that the Edinburgh Corporation had been very obstructive in regard to way-leaves. They had very much delayed the work by refusing them liberty to go in the direction they wanted. He hoped they would be less obdurate in future. It was a case of a locality urging extension on the one hand and refusing facilities on the other. He was afraid that all he could say was that he fully appreciated the importance of the particular proposals that had been made. They had certain schemes in hand and they had a certain amount of money, £250,000 this year, in order to carry them out. When these schemes were completed, other extensions would be proceeded with. He would point out, however, that he had had representations made to him, not only from Dundee and Aberdeen, but from other places, including Hull and Newcastle. Hull and Newcastle together had double the trade of Dundee and Aberdeen. It was a reason for giving considerable weight to their representations. There was one thing to which he did not think sufficient importance had been attached. His hon. friend had dwelt with particular persistency on a particular snowstorm in the north, and pointed out that the wires were broken down in consequence; but his information was that what was even worse than that was a cyclone in the south when trees were blown down. He did not think, therefore, that they could dwell too much on the question of the weather, seeing that the wind storms in the south were quite as serious as the snowstorms in the north. He was afraid he could not promise any more than he said to the deputation, that Dundee and Aberdeen should receive full consideration when the other lines were completed. He hoped his hon. friends would feel that he had endeavoured to explain the matter as fully as he could; but if they still persisted in reducing his salary he would have to grin and bear it.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he had been asked to bring forward the question of newspaper postage. He did not think the Committee realised how anomalous and contradictory the position was at the present moment. He might sum it up by saying that journals which were pounds in weight, dear in price, and small in circulation, could be posted for a halfpenny, while many other journals, a tenth of the weight and size, were charged a penny. Personally he attached no blame to the Post Office in this matter. He would not have mentioned it but for the fact that urgent representations had been made to him from influential quarters. He would illustrate the present state of the law. Papers like the *Graphic* and the *Illustrated London News* which cost sixpence could be posted for a halfpenny, whereas the postage of the *People's Friend*, a sheet an eighth or a tenth of the weight of the *Field* or any of the big sixpenny weeklies was a penny. There were other journals with which he was connected which were subject to the same grievance. It appeared to him an extremely ridiculous position that a heavy and dear journal going to wealthy people should be charged only a halfpenny postage, while a small journal which was read by poor people was charged a penny postage. He had endeavoured to get at the principle underlying the postal charges in regard to this matter, but it was rather hard to discover. He understood that a certain proportion of what was called news matter must appear in the paper to entitle it to the halfpenny rate; but it was rather difficult to know what the definition of news was, or what news was contained in some of the big weeklies. Those who, like himself, were connected with some journals were extremely grateful for the editorial assistance they got from the Post Office. Let the Committee take the case of the *Queen*. It was a most admirable journal; it contained a description of the toilets of the ladies, the latest fashions, the names of those presented at Court, and the latest elegancies in chiffons from Paris—highly interesting he was sure to ladies, and also to the gentlemen who were proud of having fashionable ladies for their wives. He did not belong to either class, and he was unable to see what news the *Queen* contained. Then there were the *Lady's Pictorial* and the *Lady*. Those papers were fashionable papers, full of fashionable intelligence, and were taken by fashionable people. But if they took *Tit-Bits* and papers of the like kind he did not see why they should not be regarded as having news, and should be charged a penny instead of a halfpenny postage. But that was not the end of the contradictory rules of the Post Office, for some of these heavy and costly papers were allowed to have advertising insets. He maintained that the distinction made by the Post Office between papers and periodicals was founded on no sane or sound principle which could be defended. He had been asked to bring in a Bill on the subject. After the experience he had had in piloting the Musical Copyright Bill through the House, he had made a vow that never again would he embark on a career as a legislator. He supposed, however, that legislators were like lovers, entitled to break their vows occasionally, and he was quite ready to start legislation again, but on one condition, viz., that the Government should put on the Committee all its forces. By a combination of that kind he believed that they might reach the desired eirenicon. He asked his right hon. friend the Postmaster-General as to whether they might have his assistance in this regard.

*MR. MCCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said that the right hon. Gentleman had hardly been fair to the Corporation of Edinburgh. So far as he understood, the complaint had really assumed very small proportions; but he thought that the Post Office was more to blame than the Corporation of Edinburgh. The point of difference was as to whether the concrete pavement in Princes Street should be torn up or the line carried a few hundred yards further round by a side street. He would urge the claim made by hon. Members for constituencies further north than Edinburgh, in regard to the extension of the underground telegraph system to Dundee and Aberdeen. He had the honour to introduce the deputation which waited upon the Postmaster-General in regard to this matter. They were charmed by the right hon. Gentleman's courtesy and sympathy, and the promises he had given them. The right hon. Gentleman indicated that it might be possible to expedite the work out of savings; but they were anxious to have a more definite statement to-day from the right hon. Gentleman than he had hitherto given as to the immediate necessity of the execution of the extension of the underground telegraph system, at least, to Aberdeen. It had been said that the recent storm which caused so much destruction and interrupted business so greatly, was greater than any which had occurred for fifty years. But storms were of very frequent occurrence along the East coast of Scotland, and caused great dislocation of business by the breaking down of overhead telegraph wires. He was sure that his right hon. friend did not minimise the necessity of proceeding with all possible despatch with the extension of the underground line, and he hoped that he would give such a promise in regard to the matter as would induce his hon. friend to withdraw his Motion for the reduction of the Vote.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth) referred to the breakdown of the service between San Francisco and New Zealand. That service was established fifty years ago, and was so successful that merchants at home and abroad used it for their correspondence. Three years ago the service which formerly was monthly was improved to a three-weekly service. In the month of February last a notice had been put in the Post Offices all over the country that letters to New Zealand should not be addressed *via* New York and San Francisco but *via* Suez Canal. He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether there was any prospect of the old service being re-established.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said he could give no information, because he had no control over the service.

MR. FELL said the new service had broken down completely. The old service was eight days shorter than the route by which letters were now sent to New Zealand, and fourteen days shorter than the alternative route. Postal services all over the world were being shortened, and it was an anomaly that one of our principal Colonies should suffer from this retrograde measure.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Gentleman was not in order in taking the line he was now doing, inasmuch as the Postmaster-General disclaimed responsibility.

MR. FELL said his complaint was that the Postmaster-General did not foresee this breakdown.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Postmaster-General says he has nothing to do with it; so the whole matter is out of order.

*MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) said he desired to direct attention to the case of sub-postmasters in what were sometimes called shop post offices. In such places as he had in mind, namely, some of the watering-places on the Firth of

Clyde, and particularly one in his own constituency, very high rents were charged for very poor accommodation. The accommodation might be adequate at other times of the year, but in the summer months the great influx of summer visitors tended to upset all the post office arrangements, and the people employed in these sub-post offices had to work from early morning till late at night for a remuneration which in his opinion was utterly inadequate to the circumstances of the case. He understood that the case of the sub-postmasters was being considered by a Select Committee, but having regard to the fact that this particular class were especially hard-worked during the summer season in certain Scottish watering-places and were working under different conditions, he desired to direct special attention to their case. He therefore took this opportunity of bringing it before his right hon. friend for favourable consideration.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) referred to what he described as an extraordinary and wanton piece of red-tapeism on the part of the Postmaster-General. The right hon. Gentleman had enacted, for the first time, that, in order to be entitled to the halfpenny postage rate, trade orders must be written not, as at present, on a plain sheet of paper, but upon a printed form. He asked for an explanation of what seemed to him to be an unreasonable and indefensible change, which prejudicially affected an enormous number of small traders throughout the country.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said he associated himself with what had fallen from the hon. Member for East Edinburgh. With regard to the underground wires to Edinburgh, he was extremely disappointed that the right hon. Gentleman had not seen his way to give more practical sympathy to the hon. Member who moved the reduction. No doubt it was a question of money, but if it had been an Irish matter instead of a Scottish matter, in all probability the money would have been forthcoming. If Scotsmen were not so out-spoken as hon. Members representing the sister isle, it was no reason why they should not be treated fairly in these matters. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to inform the Committee when he anticipated that the underground wires would be completed between Glasgow and Edinburgh. He trusted that the Postmaster-General would give them an assurance that the question of subsidy to the West India mail service would be considered in a practical and sympathetic spirit. The telegraphic service to the West Indies was at present conducted by a cable partly foreign, telegrams from Trinidad to Demerara having to pass by the West India and Panama Company's line through Cuba up to Key West. There was a proposal for an extension of the British cable, the Halifax, Bermuda, and Jamaica route, which would give an all British communication. The connection between this country and Demerara was often interrupted, and in the interest of British Guiana it was important that knowledge of the state of the markets in London and New York should be at all times available, which it was not under existing circumstances, and he hoped the Postmaster-General would consider with a sympathetic spirit the extension of the all British cable from Halifax to Trinidad.

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) acknowledged the services of the hon. Member for Canterbury in connection with postal reform, and complimented the Postmaster-General upon the courteous and energetic attention he gave to all administrative matters brought to his notice. He could not say the same of permanent officials at a distance from headquarters, and he complained that in the Highlands too much attention was given to representations of landlords and sporting tenants, those officials taking the information from them instead of from the people and local representatives of the people. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman, on further inquiry in those matters which he now had in hand, would consider the wants of the people first and those of the landlords and sporting tenants second. He thanked the Postmaster-General for carrying out the simplification of withdrawals by depositors in Post Office banks—a great advantage to depositors and a saving of official clerical work. He directed attention to the practice of postmasters in country districts of appointing girl telegraphists. In the great central districts these places are filled by competitive examination, but in the country districts the postmaster was in the habit of putting in whoever he chose; he might put in his own daughter or some relative, or if he were a bachelor, what was more natural than he should put in, say, the younger sister of his *fiancée*. Again he urged that a better steamer service should be provided for conveyance of the Stornoway mails. This was an old grievance. The Stornoway mails for many years had been carried by an old steamship that had been subsidised to carry these mails between Kyle and Stornoway. The service was inadequate and for many years past a better steamer had been asked for. Years ago they had been told that the correspondence and parcels dealt with by this service were not sufficient to warrant the postal authorities in paying an extra £1,200 or £1,500 a year. The number of letters and parcels had, however, trebled in the last few years and he trusted, therefore, that the right hon. Gentleman would approach the Chancellor of the Exchequer and get the additional money, or take it out of his balance before he handed it over to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

*Mr. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing) said that he recognised the unfailing courtesy of the Postmaster-General in dealing with the complaints which had arisen during the past official year in the Ealing Division, but there was one subject which was a most pressing and urgent one and upon which there was in the borough of Ealing a strong feeling. In population and importance it should have better postal facilities and not be subjected to the delay caused by mails being distributed from Paddington, and continue to be a sub-office to that district. Letters posted in the division for delivery in the neighbourhood were sent up to Paddington only to be there sorted and returned. This was the cause of considerable delay and inconvenience and created much dissatisfaction in this district. He hoped that the subject would receive the sympathetic consideration of the right hon. Gentlemen. He also called attention to the delays that arose in consequence of the arbitrary division of the north and north-west London districts. If the hon. Member for the Scotland Division was bold enough, with his past experience, to embark upon the promotion of fresh legislation and to deal with newspaper-postage anomalies there were other subjects which deserved his consideration, but he would suggest to the Postmaster-General that he should himself introduce a Bill on postal matters and require that all letters of a certain class should have the name and address of the sender upon the envelopes. Professional money-lenders sent out letters in every conceivable form, so that one would think that one was receiving an invitation to a social at home, and some of them bore crests or other marks, all being clothed in a style which compelled one's attention. On opening those communications one found that they contained a most seductive circular offering aid to anyone in temporary difficulties on exceptional terms. If the Postmaster-General could see his way to compelling these gentlemen to put their names and addresses on the envelopes, they would all go direct into the waste-paper basket, as they deserved to do. Another class were the betting fraternity, whose communications might be similarly distinguished.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) asked if any reduction was contemplated in the telegraph rates to India. As he understood, three or four years ago it was decided that the reductions then made were to last for two years longer. As the matter was one of very great importance, if the right hon. Gentleman could see his way to give them any information it would be very acceptable, because speedy and cheap communication with India was a necessity and at the present moment the necessity was more evident than usual. Another question was this. He found that there was great difficulty in getting communication in Africa to Blantyre. Frequently the wires were down for between a week and a fortnight. He did not know how far this was under the right hon. Gentleman's control. He believed the line was the property of the British South Africa Company, and no doubt there were great difficulties with the line towards Nyassa Land. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would be able to give him some information, as the matter was of importance to a good many people.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON said with regard to the last two questions it was not a matter for the Post Office, and the same answer really applied to one or two other questions which had been raised. In regard to the Colonial service he very much regretted what had occurred. They were now in negotiation with the Treasury and the Royal Mail Company, and he hoped that they would be able to come to some arrangement with regard to that important service. There was a very considerable grievance as to the way in which that service had been conducted. He had been asked about the Cable Company; that again was a matter over which he had no control. The hon. Member for Ealing had asked him a question about the Ealing Office. It was very much a matter of jealousy, a matter of rivalry in the district, and he was afraid that under the circumstances he could hold out no hope, but he would take the Ealing case into consideration. The hon. Member for Ealing had asked him about certain classes of letters and circulars which were sent through the Post. A number of concessions had been made in regard to the quantity and variety of documents which might be sent through the post, and the number of letters and circulars sent had greatly increased. In connection with the particular form of letter to which the hon. Member referred, it would be very difficult to detect, and though the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman might be possible in some cases yet it might give rise to some disadvantage. Looking at the matter all round he did not think that there was cause for complaint because generally there had been a considerable extension of the documents that could be sent through the halfpenny post. He would keep the matter under his consideration as he would like to give a little more attention to it, but at the present moment his view was that the concessions which had been made were too important to be withdrawn. He was quite prepared to look into the matter again; but he could see the difficulty in which it would place a number of persons. The hon. Member for Ross-shire had addressed to him a question about the telegraphic withdrawals from the Savings Bank, and he was glad to see that it had not led to fraud. As far as he could recollect there had been scarcely a case in which there had been fraudulent appropriation, and he thought that the plan was a great success. As regarded the question of the learners he quite agreed that the system of minimising nominations should continue. With regard to Stornoway his recollection about that was vague.

Mr. WEIR said the postal business at Stornaway had increased during the last few years. The population of the island was 31,000, and they wanted very badly indeed a larger subsidy in order that a better steamer might be provided for the service.

Mr. SIDNEY BUXTON said he recollected the fact, and he would see what could be done with regard to Stornoway. In reference to the point raised by his hon. friend the Member for Inverness Burghs, all he could say with reference to it was that they were pressing on with the money at their disposal as rapidly as they could, on the system to which he had referred. That must be completed first before they could decide what would be the next step to take. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that the Aberdeen line and the other lines would certainly be treated with the utmost possible consideration. He quite appreciated the great importance of those towns and the great commercial disadvantages to which they were subject, in consequence not only of big storms, but of the other causes to which his hon. friend had referred. They were not negotiating with regard to Indian telegraph rates. His hon. friend knew that a few years ago there was a very considerable reduction of rates, and these were public companies over which he had no control. His hon. friend for the Scotland division had raised a very important point. He had said that the present state of the newspaper law was chaotic. He wanted to point out to him that the circumstances to which he referred were not under his control at all. They all came under the Act of 1870, which was passed at the instigation of the newspaper proprietors at the time. He could only say that he was not prepared to introduce legislation with regard to it. He thought his hon. friend would understand that he could not make any promise on behalf of the Government; to add to the number of Bills, seeing that they had already had two all-night sittings on a Bill of the hon. Gentleman, would be a very risky thing to do.

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

---

### LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (ELECTRIC SUPPLY) BILL [BY ORDER].

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) moved that the Bill be read a second time that day six months. If the powers which were given by the Bill were carried out at all it would result in the very worst form of municipal trading. It practically extinguished private enterprise and the wholesome competition which tended to economy and efficiency over a very large area. The Bill would establish a statutory monopoly over an area of some 700 square miles, including not only the county of London, but parts of Essex, Kent, Surrey, and Middlesex. Over the whole of this vast district private enterprise in the supply of electricity would be entirely extinguished, with the exception of two enterprises which were expressly excepted—the municipal electric supplies of Marylebone and Woolwich, which had presumably been excluded because those enterprises were in a bad way. They all agreed that the position of the Metropolis was not at all up-to-date, although he did not think this Bill was the right way to remedy that condition of affairs. The present position was established by the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, under which some fifty independent generating stations and systems were set up on a comparatively small scale and applying to comparatively small areas. Since the establishment of the fifty existing enterprises the demand not only for supply in bulk on a large scale, but for other supplies, had become so great that those fifty enterprises had been for a long time incapable of meeting anything like a popular demand. It could not be done cheaply and efficiently by small enterprises over small areas. It was now possible with the improvements that had taken place in electrical engineering and science to provide electricity over a large area very cheaply indeed, and he believed it could be provided at considerably less than a penny per unit. He thought they were agreed that there must be some kind of control over the enterprises set up, and that for the metropolitan area the London County Council should be the controlling authority. The Select Committee which sat last year recommended, in Clause 18 of their Report, that the County Council should be the authority. The Committee added—

> "The Committee have in view the fact that the County Council, as this authority, may exercise its powers in more than one way:—(*a*) The County Council may undertake the whole work, providing every authorised distributor and every private consumer with electricity in bulk at a maximum scale of prices; (*b*) the County Council may retain for itself one part of the undertaking, while permitting a private enterprise to undertake another part; (*c*) the County Council may lease for a substantial consideration the whole enterprise to a private enterprise, to resume possession of it when its initial stages are over."

There were those three alternatives, and it was on the last alternative that there was a possibility that the objection which he was putting before the House to this Bill might be removed. The first and second of those alternatives were very objectionable, because they set up a statutory municipal monopoly. The Bill had been introduced by the London County Council several times. There were Bills in 1902 and 1903, and there was the Bill this year. The Bill of last year went up to the Select Committee, but that Committee found that the preamble was not proved, and the Bill fell to the ground. The principal difference in this Bill as compared with the Bill of last year consisted in the fact that last year's Bill was only permissive, and there was no obligation upon the County Council, having taken over all the electrical enterprises in this 700 square miles, to provide electricity in bulk for any purpose at all, either to a company or to an individual. But that was to a certain extent removed in the Bill they were now discussing. This Bill was to a certain extent obligatory, but the obligation was rendered almost nugatory by the power which the County Council were endeavouring to obtain by the Bill to insist on a very long term of contracts under somewhat onerous conditions. The Bill gave power to the London County Council to take over all existing undertakings except the two which he had mentioned—Woolwich and Marylebone, which they apparently did not desire to take over for financial reasons. For this purpose the County Council would be entitled under the Bill to raise £4,500,000 capital under Clause 54, and also an absolutely indefinite sum under Clause 55. In fact the powers of increasing the indebtedness of London were almost unlimited under the Bill. That was one of the principal objections which he had to it. The method provided for the repayment of the money was absolutely unsound. The Bill sought to set up that the repayment should be by a sixty years sinking fund, the repayment not to begin till the year 1913, so that for all practical purposes the repayment was spread over sixty-five years. What was the life of electrical plant? Was it not the height of folly to set up a sinking fund in respect of a vast electrical undertaking extending over sixty-five years, which was many times the life of an electrical plant? Even if the plant could be made to last that period it was perfectly certain that, with the progress of science and invention, the existing plant would have to be replaced over and over again before this vast sum of money was repaid. Then, in addition, there would have to be another sinking fund to meet the purchase of the existing liabilities of the undertakings acquired. Therefore the ratepayers of London would be saddled with two sinking funds, one of an ascertainable amount, and the other of an absolutely unknown amount which would be incurred under the powers of this Bill. Not only would the ratepayers of London be saddled with these two sinking funds, but their credit would be pledged for the benefit of a large area outside the county of London. If the enterprise was a failure, the loss would fall on the ratepayers of the county of London, not on the whole area of 700 square miles. The area outside the county of London would have no financial responsibility at all, and for that reason the ratepayers of London had very good reason to distrust this Bill. Beyond those which he had mentioned there were a number of other powers set up by the Bill. One was the power to trade in electrical appliances of all kinds. That would be a very dangerous interference with the wholesome competition of private enterprise, and should not be permitted to any municipal body. The objections he had raised to the Bill were principally on financial grounds. Municipal enterprise which excluded private enterprise was almost always a financial failure. It was neither economical nor efficient, and he thought the ratepayers of London who would have to pay for the vast scheme set up by this Bill had a right to look for economical and efficient working. On the other hand, the Moderate Party, the Party now in power on the London County Council, were the Party opposed to municipal monopoly and municipal trading in competition with private enterprise. They disapproved and he disapproved of the policy of taxing capital in order to compete against that capital. He hoped that in the course of the debate that night some authoritative statement would be made on behalf of the County Council, which might remove the objections he had raised to the Bill. From a recent debate in the County Council he gathered that if this Bill passed the Council would lease their powers under it to private companies. If the Council leased their powers, then there would be that competition by private companies which was so necessary to efficiency and public economy. If he got an authoritative statement that that would be done, he would withdraw his opposition to the Bill.

*SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.), on behalf of his constituents, seconded the rejection of the Bill. Marylebone had been entirely left out of this Bill, because, he thought, of the fact that the electric lighting undertaking which the borough council had acquired had not been a great financial success. Perhaps that was not the reason, but unless some undertaking was given on behalf of the London County Council that what was proposed in this Bill would not further handicap the Borough Council of Marylebone in regard to their undertaking he would have to press the Amendment to a division. Hon. Members were no doubt aware that a very large outlay had been incurred by the Borough Council of Marylebone in acquiring the electric undertaking. The council went to arbitration with the company, and a very large award was given to the company. One of the chief reasons for the size of the award was that the borough council were to have a monopoly of the electric lighting supply in Marylebone. But now, under this Bill, a private company might come into competition with the Marylebone Borough Council and supply electricity in Marylebone. It was not fair that Marylebone, having paid a big price for the monopoly of supply, should have it taken away from them and that private companies should have power to compete.

Amendment proposed.

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. WOOD (Glasgow, St. Rollox) said that the hon. Member for Rye, in moving the rejection, had given a strong reason why the Bill should be passed into law. He had pointed out that, while the present system of generating in a small area was unsatisfactory and did not satisfy the public demand, yet he believed that an adequate system for an adequately large area would be capable of producing an economic supply and fulfilling the requirements of the commerce of London. It was for that very reason this Bill was brought in by the County Council. They would not do anything to extinguish the private enterprises that existed at present. On the contrary, if the scheme of the late Council had been allowed to proceed, it would have recognised that these existing companies had a statutory right until 1931, and suitable arrangements would have been made with them. Parliament intended that the ultimate authority should be the municipal authority, because it provided that these companies should be purchased, most of them in 1931. He would frankly say why Marylebone and Woolwich were not included in this Bill. The reason was that both these authorities committed the mistake of allowing a company to set itself up within their area, and then had to buy the undertakings at an enormous cost. The Marylebone company only spent £500,000 on their works, and yet the borough had to pay them £1,200,000—a profit of £700,000 made in a very short time.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: Is that a reason why Marylebone should be left out of this Bill?

*MR. WOOD replied that the Council hesitated to encumber the new municipal undertaking with that enormous premium of £700,000 upon a single small undertaking. He sympathised in some respects with the feelings of the hon. Member for Marylebone. He was glad that he was taking up the position of defending the interest of that borough. He was himself a resident in Marylebone, and had to pay the high price due to the enormous premium which the Council had paid for the electric undertaking.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Can the hon. Member say who were the chief witnesses for the Marylebone Borough Council?

*MR. WOOD said he would not go into these personal matters on that occasion. The hon. Member had raised another matter in regard to which he sympathised with him very much. He had said he objected to a private company coming into competition with the borough council of Marylebone after it had paid such an enormous premium to obtain a monopoly. There was a reasonable objection. It was in the first place to protect the interests of the municipal authorities of London that the County Council originally took up this question. But that was an argument against leasing to a company, because, supposing the whole area of the undertaking were leased to a company, what would prevent that company from competing with the Marylebone Borough Council in such a way as to bring about the disastrous results which the hon. Member anticipated and feared? He supported the Second Reading of this Bill. That might not appear remarkable, because he backed it; yet some explanation was needed. The Bill was prepared by the late Progressive London County Council and was denounced in the most unmeasured terms at the last election.

It was now promoted by the new Moderate County Council. He was bound to say that it was with avowedly different intentions that the majority of the present Council desired that this Bill should go to a Second Reading. It was with a view to passing over the undertaking to private enterprise. [Cries of "No."] Their present intention was to hand over the whole undertaking to private enterprise and not to deal with it as the Progressive County Council would have done. He did not know that they would be able, on further reflection, to do that, but that was their present intention. Nevertheless he agreed to support the Second Reading because he felt the urgency of the question, and he did not wish to be responsible for any delay in dealing with it. He regretted that the Bill of last year had not been passed. He hoped the Bill would go before a Committee of this House which would thus obtain control over the whole question. He presumed that some Committee of this House would have to be satisfied that the conditions proposed would be in the public interest before power to deal with the matter would be given. He was certain that the present County Council could not say that they were being treated in a Party spirit. What the last County Council desired, when it brought in what was called a Permissive Bill in 1906, was to keep a free hand as regarded expenditure until they came to an arrangement with the existing companies before further public money was expended. Last year's Committee said that the County Council should bring in a more thorough-going measure and should be under an obligation to provide a cheap supply. The Committee would doubtless take care to see that the new scheme did guarantee a cheap supply, and that the interests of the consumers of electricity, both large and small manufacturers, were thoroughly safeguarded. Another essential was that there should be a really comprehensive scheme dealing with the large area covering 700 square miles which had been proposed, with a large generating station economically placed, where it would not be a nuisance to any populous part of London. It must not merely perpetuate present conditions and maintain a number of small and uneconomical generating stations. A third condition was that the County Council must be the authority as recommended by the Committee last year. It must also protect existing municipal interests. There was a large ratepayers' interest involved, for the municipal authorities had spent some £6,500,000 of public money on electrical enterprise. Nothing must be done to put a company in a position to dominate over the interests of the ratepayers of London and the district round about. Then they had the tramways to safeguard. It was calculated that in a short time the amount of electrical energy required for the tramways would equal the output of the whole of the borough councils. That would be one difficulty in the path of leasing. He did not see how, under any system of leasing, they were going to safeguard the interests of the borough councils and the ratepayers whom they represented. There were three difficulties in the way of leasing—how to protect the local authorities, how to protect the rights of the statutory companies at present existing, and how to obtain a sufficiently comprehensive scheme with a sufficiently large system of generation. An important reason for supporting the Second Reading was that the Bill contained a provision for the purchase of the companies by the Council in 1931. He did not doubt that a Committee of this House would decide the matter in the interests neither of the Council nor of any competing body, but with a view to obtaining a wise solution of a problem that had remained unsolved too long—the provision of an economical and adequate supply of energy for the manufactures of London, and, of course, the House would reserve the right of finally dealing with the Bill when it came back from the Committee.

*MR. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster) said that on the present occasion he was going to support the Second Reading of the Bill although he last year moved its rejection, and he hoped he might be able to satisfy his hon. friend who moved its rejection this year and the hon. Member who had just sat down that he was justified in doing so. Last year a compromise was arrived at by which this Bill and other Bills were referred to a Select Committee, and on that understanding he withdrew his opposition to the Bill, and having done so, although he did not say they were bound to accept the Report of the Committee, he did think that they were bound to consider it very carefully. Its terms had been quoted that evening so he need not repeat them, but he would say that he did not think that the hon. Gentlemen opposite who represented the Progressive Party in the London County Council could complain if they on that side adopted the terms of the compromise which they considered most favourable to their view and the most likely to serve the interests of the ratepayers of London. That Report suggested alternative schemes, and his hon. friend who moved the rejection of the Bill mentioned one such scheme. The Committee suggested that the County Council might lease for a substantial consideration for a certain period the whole enterprise with a view of resuming possession of it when the initial stages were over. He could hardly think that even the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down would suggest that after the last County Council election the County Council could ask this House to adopt any but the last alternative suggested by the Committee last year. It was perfectly true to say that the electrical power scheme of the late County Council was one of the chief questions which were debated on every platform during the last County Council election, and there could be no manner of doubt as to what was the answer of the ratepayers of London. It appeared to him to be absolutely impossible to embark upon what they considered last year, and what they considered now to be a great and risky scheme of electrical supply, in view of the result of the elections to which he had just referred. He did not know that it would be necessary now to refer to the report of the Finance Committee from which he quoted somewhat fully last year, but the Committee evidently thought that it was advisable that the County Council should see whether the alternative scheme would not be the best to adopt. The Parliamentary Committee of the London County Council, which considered this scheme, reported in these terms—

> "We think that the alternative provisions in the Bill may be utilised for the purpose of securing some arrangement under which the financial risks to which the Finance Committee called attention may be avoided, and in which the business of the supply of electrical energy may be carried out by private enterprise under the control of the Council, and that the Bill should be proceeded with with that object in view."

Further, they suggested a resolution which was subsequently adopted at a meeting of the London County Council which ran—

> "That the London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill be submitted for Second Reading in the House of Commons with a view to securing an arrangement under which private enterprise undertakes, subject to the control of the Council, the business of the supply of electrical energy, and on the understanding that such alterations as may be required in the Bill to effect this object and to deal with any other matters of importance which may arise on the Bill, will be reported to the Council for its approval as soon as possible."

No doubt the conditions of leasing to which the hon. Gentleman referred must be the subject of inquiry either by a Committee of this House or by a Committee of both Houses, but it did not seem that to devise satisfactory conditions was out of the reach of the ingenuity of such Committees or of the gentlemen who appeared before them as counsel. At any rate he thought that the present County Council could be trusted not to waste the ratepayers' money. He confessed that he had listened to the speech of the hon. Gentleman with some amusement, because he remembered very well—he was not quoting the words—that on this Bill last year he suggested that the County Council as an institution was indentified with the Progressive Party and the Progressive Party alone, and also suggested that the ratepayers of London in the past had shown confidence in the institution as conducted by that Party by constantly returning members of it to the London County Council. Circumstances had changed cases and much had happened since the hon. Gentleman spoke.

Mr. WOOD said he did not recognise the quotation.

*Mr. W. F. D. SMITH said he would read what the hon. Gentleman said—

> "His last word would be about the ratepayer. There was a notion common in some quarters that the County Council did not protect the ratepayer. If so it was an extraordinary thing how the ratepayers for so many years had approved of that institution."

He thought that any hon. Gentleman reading that quotation would take it to mean that the Progressive Party and the Progressive Party alone were indentified with the institution, but he thought the ratepayers had shown during the last twelve months that they looked upon the Moderate Party, as at present constituted, as more efficient guardians of the ratepayers' pockets than the Progressive Party had been in the past. As he had said, the circumstances had changed, but he thought his hon. friend might be quite certain that due care and economy would be observed in the exercise of any powers conferred on the Council by this Bill. He could not but hope, therefore, that his hon. friend would be satisfied with such an explanation, and be content to withdraw his opposition.

*MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.) regretted that he had to differ from his hon. friend the Member for the St. Rollox Division, although nobody could be more sensible of the services to London in general, and in regard to this subject in particular, which the hon. Member had rendered. It seemed to him, however, that his hon. friend, having uttered able and forcible arguments against the clauses of this Bill, had ended his argument rather lamely by asking the House to vote for the Second Reading. He rose to ask the House to reject this Bill because it contained the leasing clause—Clause 66. He would like to remind the House of the extraordinarily grave interests which were involved in this measure. It dealt with an area which he might be allowed, perhaps, to call the area of the new London—the greater London of the future. That area consisted of about 700 square miles, in which there was at present a population of 7,000,000 of people, and this was likely to have expanded to 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 before any lease would have lapsed. Yet it was proposed under this Bill, while nominally making the London County Council the electrical authority for this great area, to give powers to an authority which they knew had a full intention, indeed a declared intention, to hand over those powers for a considerable period, a period which would probably extend far beyond the lifetime of hon. Members who were listening to him, to some limited liability company, or, if he might use the word in a way which would not be misunderstood, to some trust. This was a great business and had long passed out of the experimental stage. We had in the United Kingdom some 110 or 120 successful electrical municipal undertakings in being. The position of these undertakings was shown by a Return made to this House a few years ago. That Return showed that, allowing for the burden of the sinking fund and the interest upon the capital which had to be raised, electrical undertakings were not a burden upon municipalities which had undertaken this work. He also pointed out that in Germany where municipalities possessed freedom of action, electrical municipal undertakings were a great success. He would quote the cases of Munich and Breslau as instances in which, by means of these undertakings, not only had the interest on the capital been paid, but a sufficient sum been set aside for the sinking fund, and in addition handsome sums had been given in relief of taxation. In Munich in the last year for which he had figures the profits so handed over were £17,000 and in Breslau £20,000. Even taking the case of Berlin, which was more backward in these respects than other portions of the German Empire, the lease which had been granted expired in 1915, and in that year there could be no doubt whatever that the undertaking would be taken over by the town council of Berlin. These results had been attained and were undeniable, and yet they found that in regard to this great city, which was the capital of the Empire and he might almost say the capital of the world, there was this want of trust in the managing ability of the people of London, and they found it alleged by hon. Members opposite that there was risk in the matter. If there was such risk as hon. Members opposite alleged, why were so many keen company promoters desirous to undertake this business? His hon. friend the Member for the St. Rollox Division had mentioned many advantages which the London County Council possessed as compared with a private capitalist, but he had not mentioned one of the chief of them, viz., access to cheap money. The London County Council could command capital for this undertaking at probably 1 per cent. less than the company promoters. At the end of the lease the undertaking would have to be bought back loaded with unnecessary capital. The London County Council started with a magnificent business already made in their tramway undertaking. He asked what guidance the Government would give in this situation, which he compared to the situation many years ago, when Governments failed to realise what the future of railways must be in this country. As a consequence we now had privately owned railways, loaded with watered capital, depressing wages while keeping up railway rates. To-day, however, the Government could not plead ignorance of the tremendous future of electricity. They knew that 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 or even 15,000,000 who were going to live upon all these square miles must be the customers of the municipality for light and power in their homes, and in their manufacturing and business premises. Therefore a large number of customers was certain, and this number was no less certain to grow, and yet, knowing this, it was proposed that we should actually resign our interest in the question to some unknown party to whom would be committed the future of electrical power in London. It was not merely a question of ordinary economic development, but there was a question of social development behind it, because means should be provided which would enable us to remove our industrial enterprises to the borders of London. That could not be done without a proper distribution of electrical power. Finally, there was the great labour question, of which he would remind his friends on the Labour Benches opposite. What was the use of complaining about poverty and the distribution of wealth so long as they allowed these great national monopolies to be the prey of private capital? He invited the House to reject the measure unless they could obtain the entire deletion of Clause 66 or unless such an instruction to the Committee was agreed to as would ensure that, if a lease were granted to a private undertaking, it should terminate not later than 1931, and unless proper safeguards were inserted on the points of price, time, and dividends.

Mr. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said it was very embarrassing to be called upon to vote on the Second Reading of a Bill which was not at all the Bill which the promoters intended to ask the House to pass into law. A great local body asked for a great monopoly of franchise, and at the same time declared that the moment they got it they proposed to confer the whole power on a private company. He hoped that before the powers included in Clause 66 were granted the promoters would set out the leading terms and conditions of the contract under which they proposed to lease them. It did not seem to him either an unpractical or unreasonable proposal, and he based himself upon what was said by the Chairman of the London County Council the other day. He said, "Give us one or perhaps two years that we may have plenty of time to make our negotiations with any company or companies which may come before us." If they were asking for one or two years why should they not consent, when this Bill went into Committee upstairs, to a clause binding them, before carrying into effect the powers of Clause 66, to come to Parliament and set out the terms and conditions of the lease which they proposed to give? He had said that he had grave doubt as to the vote he should give on the Second Reading of this Bill, but on the whole he had come to the conclusion to vote for the Second Reading. For many years now they had been engaged in the work of keeping a number of syndicates and companies from obtaining a great monopoly for the supply of electric power. It had been a difficult work; it had required all their efforts; and, no doubt, if the Bill should be rejected by the House that night the companies would renew their efforts, and he was very much afraid that they would not be able to resist them. He thought it would be better to give this great monopoly to the County Council even though they handed it over to a private company, rather than that it should go to a private company direct without the intervention of the London County Council. That was the result which he feared might follow if this Bill were rejected that night. Therefore, for the reasons he had given he intended to record his vote in favour of the Second Reading.

*Mr. BOWERMAN (Deptford) said he opposed the Bill not on the ground put forward by the mover and seconder of the Amendment, but rather on the ground presented by the hon. Member for North Paddington. If the Bill came before the House presented by the Council with the object of taking full responsibility for running this electric power, then so far as those for whom he spoke were concerned no objection would be raised. They understood, on the contrary, however, that the intention was to ask the House for certain powers, and after those powers had been obtained, to lease them to private companies. It was on this ground that they were entering a protest against the progress of the Bill. It had been stated that the undertaking was of a risky character. They joined in the view that had been expressed already, that if it was of so risky a character there would not be such a keen desire on the part of companies to secure the undertaking. They believed that if the question had been fairly presented the County Council would have had the consent of the ratepayers of London to the running of an electric supply. They had before them the evidence of their capacity to run one of the best tramway services in this country, and if they could do that successfully—and he ventured to submit that they were doing it successfully, certainly in the interests of London and in point of efficiency it was equal to anything that he had experienced in the provinces—if the County Council could do that with the tramways, surely they had a right to assume that, if they were granted these powers for themselves, they would make an equal success of the electric supply. They had some experience in the case of Marylebone, where a company was started, and after certain experience the ratepayers expressed a desire to purchase, and they had purchased at a huge sacrifice of money; and they contended that what had been done in the case of Marylebone, so far as the success of the undertaking was concerned—judging from the expense incurred in buying it—could also be accomplished by the County Council. They believed that the same success would attend an undertaking covering the whole of London and the suburbs; and, that being so, they would welcome the Bill if they thought that the County Council intended to take the full responsibility of giving effect to it; to grant such important and far-reaching powers, knowing beforehand that it was not the intention of the County Council themselves to give effect to those powers, was a proceeding to which they were strongly opposed. Was it to be said that the great municipality of London was unable to do that which other municipalities of the country were doing day by day with the utmost success? If that opinion was entertained, it was not only a grave reflection on the capacity of the London authorities, but he was inclined to say that it was almost an insult to suggest it. If these powers were allowed to pass from the hands of the County Council it was only a question of time before history would repeat itself, and they would have to make overtures to those private companies, with the result that Londoners would find themselves compelled to buy them out at some extravagant rate.

*Mr. WATERLOW (Islington, N.) said he had not troubled the House on any previous occasion, and therefore he asked their indulgence. He rose to support this Bill as a London Member. He believed that London wanted cheap electricity for power purposes, and although he would prefer to see the London County Council do that work itself, yet he was prepared to support the Second Reading of the Bill on the principle that it was better to have half a loaf than no bread. The advantage of cheap electricity in London, and especially for small manufacturers, was of enormous importance. Cheap electricity meant cheap power. If cheap electricity could not be supplied, and London manufacturers could not get cheap power as compared with those in other cities, then London would be at a disadvantage as compared with other cities. He believed that the future of small industries in London depended on cheap power and to that extent on cheap electricity. London was the greatest city of manufacturers and small industries in the world, so that this was a matter of the utmost importance to her. The Bill embraced an area known as Greater London, and as a consequence it involved a population of perhaps 6,000,000; and, by the time this undertaking was fairly started, it would probably involve a population of 7,000,000 or 8,000,000, perhaps in a few years' time a population of 10,000,000. In giving this power to any company or corporation Parliament required to be very careful about the particulars and the details. Within the area which the Bill covered there were now working forty-five public authorities and twenty-seven public companies. All of them supplied electricity in one form or another. All these authorities were supplying electricity on a comparatively small scale compared with the scale on which this Bill proposed to proceed. As a consequence, most of the authorities were not able to produce electricity as this Bill would enable the County Council to do, no matter whether it leased the undertaking or worked it itself. The problem of cheap electricity was what was known as the problem of the "load factor." In other words, they wanted equality of load during the twenty-four hours to produce the electricity on the cheapest scale possible. They could not do that with an electric lighting company, because the maximum load was only required during a few hours of darkness, morning and night; but they could do it if they combined power to supply electricity to a much greater extent with lighting electricity. Therefore the larger the area, the larger the scale on which the thing was done, the bigger the average load, and consequently the greater cheapness. With a big undertaking like that, they could get rid of small steam engines, and small gas engines, and small methods of producing power throughout a vast number of factories, and then they would have advanced very considerably in giving benefits to London. If they could substitute for small power-producing machines various kinds of electric motors, the benefit to London would be enormous. With a big electric power producing undertaking all small manufacturers would be in the hands of that undertaking in the future. Those who used bulk electricity would be in the hands of that undertaking in the future. That would be the serious position of affairs if this Bill passed into law and those powers were leased to a company. That company would to a large extent control the power supply of a vast number of manufacturing concerns in London. Then there were the existing companies and the existing borough councils dealing with electricity in London. If this undertaking was put forward, the big concern must eventually swallow up the small ones, and they would have in London one big monopoly. That was why he thought this business ought to be kept in the hands of the public authority. Therefore, the supreme importance of this question to London was largely complicated by the existence of these electric supply companies and the existence of the borough councils. If there was to be any leasing then he attached the greatest importance to the date of 1931. In that year the existing companies, or almost all the existing companies, had all their powers purchasable by the borough councils, as the law stood at present. If leasing there was to be it must not extend beyond the year 1931, or at all events, the whole question of electric power for London must, in some form or another, come up for review in 1931, and any lease now granted by the London County Council should be capable of being reviewed when all these companies fell in for purchase. He could plainly see that this Bill involved the whole future of London as a manufacturing city, and it embraced thousands of manufacturers both large and small. It embraced the supplying of electric power for docks, harbours, railways, and tramways, and also electricity for private houses. It was not at all improbable that in the near future they might see electricity produced so cheaply that it would be a practical thing for everybody to have electric fires in the place of coal fires. That would be an enormous advantage to London and greatly for the benefit of its people who had coal fires now, not only in the way of convenience and cleanliness, but also in ameliorating the atmospheric conditions from which they all suffered so much in the shape of fogs in winter time. The area this Bill covered was so large, the population so great, and the issues involved so momentous to the future welfare of London, that he was prepared to vote for the Second Reading.

Mr. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich) said that as hon. Members who were in the last Parliament knew, this was a subject which occupied the attention of the Board of Trade to a very great extent a few years ago, and he might, perhaps, be permitted to say one or two words only in regard to it. What struck him in reference to the debate to which they had listened so far was the remarkable difference between the speech of the hon. Member for St. Rollox and the speech of the hon. Member for North Paddington. The former realised that there had been a County

Council election, but the latter seemed to think for the moment that he was addressing an audience on the issue which was before the constituencies in that election. He did not think that it was the business of the House now to go into the question of the merits or demerits to any extent of private trading as against municipal enterprise. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh."] Hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway and hon. Gentlemen opposite were now very indignant with another Assembly because it interfered with the mandate which was given to them at the last General Election. They were now setting themselves up as a House of Lords to obstruct the action of the deliberately chosen members of the London County Council. ["Oh, oh."] The hon. Member for North Paddington had spoken as if it depended upon the rate at which capital could be got——

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I only suggested that that was one of the vital factors in the matter.

MR. BONAR LAW said that was the factor which struck him as the most important in his speech. There was another factor which was at least as important as the rate at which the capital was raised, and that was the way in which the business was managed. If he believed that municipalities as a whole would manage their business undertakings as well as private enterprise he would be much more in favour of municipal enterprise. He had nothing to say against the gentlemen who were chosen as representatives on county councils and other bodies. They had had good representatives on the whole throughout the United Kingdom, but rightly or wrongly he believed that in business matters the business would be best managed where the man who made the mistake knew that he would have to pay for it out of his own pocket. If a business was to be well managed, the men who were to manage it ought to be selected on account of their quality as business men. Could anyone say that even at the last London County Council election the deciding factor was the view which the electors held as to the business capacity of the men who stood before them? Everybody knew it was not. Those were not the grounds on which his friends secured a majority on the County Council. It was not their business qualities; it was the knowledge of the complete absence of business qualities on the part of their predecessors. In an election of that kind the men were not chosen for their business qualities. Nobody would deny that. In private enterprise there was some kind of a law which governed these things, and it was the law of the survival of the fittest. They might take it as certain that in the long run if they pitted that issue against selection generally on account of their speaking qualities, it was the private enterprise man and not the municipal man who would run the business to the best advantage and make the most money out of it. The thing which impressed him was the strong demand which was expressed on the part of the manufacturers, and especially the small manufacturers of London, that in some way or other a scheme of cheaper electricity should be supplied. Suppose the House took the view of the hon. Member for North Paddington; it would certainly mean that they were not going to have this supply of electricity in any time to which any of them could reasonably look forward. They could not have it in this Parliament because the County Council would not adopt the scheme. Therefore they could never have it until the majority in this House and the majority on the County Council happened to coincide. For that reason alone he was certain that his hon. friend the Member for the St. Rollox Division was right in saying that with proper safeguards it was better to get a cheap supply of electricity now than have the thing hung up indefinitely and practically for ever. He believed that the majority on the County Council were in this matter taking the right course. They were pledged to have the business conducted by private enterprise if they could. Having taken that course their obvious duty was to obtain from Parliament powers which would enable them to make the best bargain they could in the interests of London. He had been afraid that the majority on the County Council might try to make some arrangement with a particular company, and that would be distinctly bad business. What they had got to do was to get the powers, and then try to get competition from different companies. ["Oh!"] Most certainly that was their duty—to get competition from different companies as to the terms of the lease, and to grant the lease to the company which would give to London the best terms, provided they were certain that there was enough capital in that company to carry out the obligations they agreed to undertake. That was precisely the intention of the majority of the London County Council. It was part of their policy to lease this franchise on the distinct understanding that the right of purchase at a reasonable time was to be retained to the County Council. They were going to give it on condition that the rates were to be revised just as was proposed by the administrative company two years ago—that the rates were to be subject to revision by the Board of Trade, that the scale of dividends was to be a moving scale, and that the dividend was not to get too high without a reduction in the rates; and they were also bound to make this arrangement, that they would only lease to a company if they were prepared to treat existing bodies, both municipalities and private companies, on terms which the House of Commons considered fair. If that was what the hon. Gentleman meant by saying that the County Council was bound to state clearly the conditions on which they meant to make the lease, he thought he was right. That was their duty before the Committee, but if, as the hon. Member for Bethnal Green suggested, the County Council was to be bound to come to Parliament with the definite agreement that they were going to make with a definite company, that seemed to him extremely bad business. It would prevent them getting as good an arrangement as they otherwise would if they were tied down in that way. Moreover, if the obligation was placed upon them to come to Parliament, notices would have to be lodged a long time before, and that meant that at least one year, and probably two years, would be lost before any arrangement of the kind could be come to. There was nothing more needed in a great City like London, where there were so many small industries, than that they should have a cheap supply of electricity for all purposes; and they could only get that by an arrangement such as that which was now proposed. If they rejected this proposal there was no reasonable prospect of such an arrangement being made in a reasonable time. Hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House were quite right to see that the terms of the lease were as favourable as they could get a company, with prospect of raising the necessary capital, to accept; but it was also their duty to give to the manufacturers of London, whose interest was really as great as the profits the ratepayers would make out of running the business themselves, what was, after all, more important, the chance of obtaining a cheap supply of electricity all over London.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I am rather afraid that the views of hon. Members on this Bill have been very largely coloured by the difference between the political complexion of the County Council of last year and that of the County Council of this year. The Government has nothing to do with that, and I suggest that the House of Commons ought not to consider that. We have got to deal with the Bill on its merits. The Bill is framed on the recommendations of the Committee which considered the whole matter of electric supply in London last year, and on that ground I support its Second Reading. The Bill is in the position of having been framed by a County Council which was Progressive, and it is now being promoted by a Moderate Council. I am glad the majority of London Members have taken what I would call the more temperate and more sensible view, and have decided to support a Bill which they themselves have framed. That is, I think, a very wise decision, and I am surprised they should have hesitated at all, because it is their own Bill. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] The hon. Member for Bethnal Green says it is not the Bill they framed, but it is. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] It is true that the promoters have stated that they are not going to proceed with certain clauses, but that is a matter for the Committee. The Bill before the House at this moment is the identical Bill drafted by the late County Council, but if the Committee report that they cannot recommend it if these clauses are withdrawn, then that will be a matter for the House to consider. All kinds of questions have been discussed which really have nothing to do with the Second Reading of the Bill. The question of what the Council should do with its powers afterwards seems to me irrelevant, except upon the principle that you will not allow any authority to part with its powers; but that is not the position of the London County Council. They have incorporated provisions enabling agreements to be made. It may be said the Council should not be allowed to leave the matter to private enterprise under any conditions, but that is not the opinion of most of the representatives of London. The question raised as to terms and conditions is not a question to be settled on Second Reading; it is purely a matter for Committee. I would not say that the House of Commons should part with its authority and give unlimited powers to a municipality to part with this franchise for ever; I agree with the hon. Member for Paddington and North Islington in that, but that is not a question to be discussed on the Second Reading and should not weigh with the House in giving a Second Reading decision. It may be a legitimate question to raise in an Instruction to the Committee, that there should be a limit imposed is a question of general principle, but is not relevant to the Second Reading. The hon. Member for St. Rollox in his able speech said that of course the House reserved the right to deal with the Bill when it came back from Committee—a rational view and in accordance with Parliamentary traditions. The House does not part with the right to deal with a Bill when it is sent to a Committee to be considered and reported upon; the recommendation of the Committee is submitted to the judgment of the House, and any Amendment can be moved on the Report stage. It is left open to my hon. friend after the Bill has gone to the Committee to submit his ideas and those of his friends as to the powers which ought to be given to the London County Council. Matters of detail must be threshed out in Committee. I cannot discuss the Instruction on the Paper, but I sincerely hope my hon. friends will see their way to leave the matter until the Bill returns to the House. I cannot enter into the substance of the Instruction; I will say that in my judgment it is contrary to every procedent and that it would fetter the Council in a matter where, if there is to be leasing at all, there should be freedom to make terms. I recommend my hon. friends to consider the suggestion of the hon. Member for North Paddington and direct their minds to a limitation of the power of the Council to part with its franchise in point of time. It should be so limited that the County Council in 1931 would be able to deal with the question of purchase as a whole; that is the date when most of the private enterprises might be purchased by the municipality. Some limitation of that kind is a legitimate matter to discuss as a matter of principle, but I trust the House will now give a Second Reading to the Bill. The hon. Member for Rye said that municipal enterprise in this matter had been a failure. It is simply ridiculous to make a sweeping assertion like that in face of the facts. As a matter of fact municipal enterprise in this matter has been a great success. Ten out of twelve municipal enterprises of the kind in London show a profit on a lower rate of charge. That is very important. In a matter of this kind the chief point of view of the House of Commons ought to be, not the dividend paying interest, but the interest of the consumer; and I find that the difference between the charge made by the municipalities and the charge made by the private companies is something like 1d. per unit, or about 30 per cent., lower in favour of the consumer. Moreover, the municipalities make a very considerable profit on their very reduced charges. It is the same in the provinces. I find that the gross profit made by the provincial local authorities upon a capital expenditure of £22,800,000 for the supply of electricity is over £2,000,000. The object of the municipality is not so much to make a profit as to supply electricity at the cheapest possible rate. The prime consideration of a company is to make a dividend, and with that view they naturally put their charges as high as possible. Yet here are the provincial municipalities, with every pressure put upon them to fix their charges at the lowest possible point, making the considerable profit of £2,000,000, and, what is more, with £1,265,000 for the purposes of sinking funds. Surely that is a really great triumph for municipal enterprise. This seems to be the only country in the world where there exists this terror of municipal enterprise. Go to Germany, the great bogey of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and you will find the municipalities supplying docks, electricity, water, gas, houses, and land. If I support this Bill with the power which it contains for leasing, it is not because I express any opinion in regard to leasing. I leave the London County Council to take their option. An hon. Member has quoted the example set by foreign countries in regard to railways, and I do not think he could put forward a better illustration. I have always thought it was one of the greatest misfortunes of this country, especially in competition with a country like Germany, which has State railways, that it should have parted with the railways, practically for ever, to private enterprise. Supposing the proposal of leasing that is made here in the case of electricity had been applied long ago to the railways, supposing private enterprise had been allowed to develop the railways and then the State to come in and pay a fair price for them. The whole of the railways would now be in the hands of the people, and they would be worked for the development of native industries, instead of being worked, as they are often at present, in the interest of foreign competitors.

SIR F. BANBURY: You can have the railways now at a fair price.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I know the hon. Baronet's idea of a fair price. I do not like these City notions of a fair price; it is a very hard bargain. Here we have simply now to decide the question whether we are going to carry out the recommendations of the Committee that the County Council shall have the control, and other questions can be fought out afterwards.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich) said he could not agree with the right hon. Gentleman that this Bill was identical with that of last year.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is not what I have stated. I said that the Bill of last year was sent upstairs to a Committee, which recommended that there should be a different Bill this year. I have said it was the same Bill as was introduced by the Progressive County Council.

MR. CROOKS said, as a matter of fact, it was not, for it contained a leasing clause.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That clause was in the Bill framed by the Progressive County Council.

MR. CROOKS asked why it was, in that case, that the Progressive Party had put on the Paper an Instruction to the Committee on the Bill. The leasing clause practically meant that they would be compelled to lease, and then exactly the same thing would happen as they had experienced in the case of tramway leases, under which the County Council had been unable to improve the hours of labour, or rates of wages, or reduce the fares. It was said that as there would be competition they would get a good price; but what would happen would be that there would be an amalgamation of the electrical companies in London who would arrange the price before they went to the County Council. Many of the local authorities had already got electrical plant; were they going to allow a great trust to come in and practically scrap that plant, leaving the authorities to bear the burden of the rates? They had just heard from the President of the Board of Trade the same old official arguments. There had been no change of Government in his life. ["Oh."] There had only been a change of representation in the House of Commons. They always got the same kind of argument from right hon. Gentlemen that everything was all right, and they must allow the present position of things to go on. They could never bring about a revolution merely with a change of representation. The permanent officials were against the proposal. But he urged the House to open its eyes and not give away the inheritance that belonged to the people of London. The Council ought to have full power to supply the electricity, because otherwise the Moderates and their friends on the Stock Exchange would "rig" this electric supply as they "rigged" a loan a few days ago.

*MR. DICKINSON (St. Pancras, N.) said he hoped the House would pardon his intervention on this occasion, but he spoke on the authority of London Members, and had on their authority put an Instruction on the Paper. The County Council, now representing the opposite Party, put forward a proposal with which he disagreed, but in such a form that he felt it difficult to oppose, because as it stood before the House it was a Bill with a great deal of which he could agree. The London Members felt that London stood at perhaps the most serious crisis in its municipal life. It was important that the House of Commons should understand the position of the Party now in ascendency on the Council. It had been frankly admitted that a subsidiary clause of the Bill—namely, one empowering the Council to transfer its powers to a private undertaking—would in Committee be made the main purpose of the Bill. Therefore this was a Bill which proposed to start a system by which powers given to a local authority might be handed over *en bloc* to a private undertaking. He thought that consideration ought to alter the position which had been adopted by the President of the Board of Trade. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that he was for acting on principles of local autonomy, and that the London County Council if they had these powers should be left to decide whether they should hand them over to a private company or not. That principle of local autonomy was new, so far as his connection with the London County Council was concerned. Even in the Bill of last year which proposed to give the Council a free hand in dealing with this question of electricity the Board of Trade asked the House not to allow the autonomy that was now suggested. And surely London Members of Parliament had also some right to speak on behalf of London, and they begged the House carefully to consider before it took a step which would grant to the County Council the right to do exactly what it liked in setting up a new system of franchises to private undertakings. The main question was as to whether it was expedient that a public authority should actually work an undertaking such as this or that a private company should do it. It was well that the House should be given an opportunity of really considering the question of the respective merits of public municipal ownership as against private enterprise. The hon. Member for Dulwich had announced himself as absolutely opposed to municipalities carrying on this work, but he had said that if it could be proved that the work of the municipalities was more beneficial than that of companies he would change his opinion. He (Mr. Dickinson) had had opportunities of studying municipal undertakings pretty extensively during many years, and he believed that it could be proved conclusively that work of this character carried on by a public authority was more efficacious and more economical than work carried on by companies. He could give the House many figures with regard to that, but he would avoid too much detail. He would draw the attention of the hon. Member to the Returns which had been given to the House of the respective trading capacity of municipal tramway undertakings and those of private tramway companies. If hon. Gentlemen would look at those Returns they would see that on an average the municipalities had been able to lay down tram lines at a cheaper rate per mile than the companies, that they had worked them with a smaller percentage of working expenses on gross receipts and that their net revenue showed a considerably greater percentage return on the capital expenditure than that of the companies; and moreover the net revenue per mile was larger than the net revenue per mile of the companies, and the average fare charged was smaller than the average fare charged by the companies. He could show that the same thing applied all through England, Scotland and Ireland. If they considered the southern tramway undertaking of the London County Council and compared it with the undertaking of the London United Tramways Company, they would find that the same thing held good throughout — there were cheaper fares, it was more economically worked, and the return in actual percentage on the capital was considerably greater in the case of the London County Council system. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had told the House that in his opinion the borough councils carried on their electric lighting undertakings more economically than the companies. That was perfectly correct, and the same thing applied in other countries. In Germany, the municipalities made a point of working their own undertakings, and they did so with the approval of the trading community in those towns. That was one of the reasons why Germany had been so prosperous. And if they went to the United States they would see precisely the other thing happening. Any hon. Gentleman who had been through

New York knew perfectly well the condition of the streets in that city. No town he had ever seen was anything like so bad as regarded its paving as New York. He had had the advantage of going through the streets of New York in company with one of the principal officials of the municipalities of New York. He asked him the reason why the streets were in that condition, and he replied that it was due to the fact that the tramways had been leased and handed over to a company, with the control of the repair of the streets in the hands of that company, and he added that the council would not exercise their powers to force the company to repair the streets. If he had had a free hand he could have put the streets of New York into good repair in a few months. He ventured to ask the House, with the knowledge of what the granting of franchises had come to in American cities, whether it was not an important question for them to consider whether they would establish that system in London. He believed no greater disaster could happen to London than that they should establish this system of franchise, which was at present unknown in this country. The President of the Board of Trade had referred to the Committee of this House which sat last year, and had pointed to a recommendation, as he called it, that appeared to indicate that one of the solutions, if not the proper solution, was to have some system of leasing. He wished to point out that this suggestion was not made the subject of any definite recommendation. The Committee of last year brought up a Report which recommended that the powers of supply should be entrusted to the London County Council. That Report when it was drafted had no reference whatever to any question of leasing, and it was not until the proposal was made by the hon. Member for Wolverhampton that Clause 18 was inserted. Clause 18 read thus—

> "In recommending that the County Council should be the authority, the Committee desire to refer to the statement made by Mr. Llewellyn Smith, on behalf of the Board of Trade, which they regard as of great value. The Committee have in view the fact that the County Council, as this authority, may exercise its powers in more than one way."

And then they set out the three ways in which the County Council might exercise its powers, namely—

> "It might undertake the whole work, providing every authorised distributor and every private consumer with electricity in bulk at a maximum scale of prices; it might retain for itself one part of the undertaking, while permitting a private enterprise to undertake another part; or it might lease for a substantial consideration the whole enterprise to a private enterprise, to resume possession of it when its initial stages are over; and the Committee add that they are of opinion that the Report of the finance committee of the County Council renders desirable a careful consideration of alternative schemes."

That was based evidently on the statement made on behalf of the Board of Trade, and if hon. Members would look at the evidence that was given before that Committee they would find that Mr. Llewellyn Smith, speaking on behalf of the Board of Trade said—

> "I desire to avoid expressing any general opinion of the Board of Trade on this very controversial question of the comparative advantages of public and private management. If it were possible to arrive at some scheme which would combine the advantages of public control with the elasticity and initiative of private enterprise you would have found the ideal solution of a very difficult problem, but that is not one upon which I am here to give any opinion."

He ventured to submit that the question of leasing as against working had never really been considered by any Committee of the House, and that Members of the Committee who reported last year would themselves be the first to say that the proposals now before the House were not put forward in accordance with any recommendation they made. Although the Instruction which he had placed on the Paper could not be moved, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade would consider very carefully whether he was going to force them to have a private company thrust upon the ratepayers of London without any opportunity of the House considering the terms and conditions.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) said that as a new Member of the House he viewed with pleasure and admiration, and with some amount of jealousy, the special pleading of the hon. Member for Dulwich; but he thought Members both young and old would agree that they never anticipated that the President of the Board of Trade would run the hon. Gentleman such a race, especially in face of some previous discussions that had taken place in the House in regard to this particular subject. He had no intention of making quotations from some of the speeches delivered by the right hon. Gentleman, but if he did so it would show how easy it was to answer the foremost of our statesmen, no matter to which Party they belonged, by their own previous statements. This was not the Bill of the London County Council that they were considering. They were bound, whatever might be said by the President of the Board of Trade, to read into its clauses the expressed and published intentions of its present promoters. It was utterly absurd to pretend that if the Bill as it stood were sent to a Committee, as was suggested by the President of the Board of Trade, the present County Council would accept it as a solution of this particular problem. They were going considerably to modify some of its clauses, and some of its principles they had expressed their intention of entirely removing. What was intended to be a subsidiary sub-section of the Bill was now to be made its main feature. The right hon. Gentleman would have been much better advised if he had suggested to the House that, as this was not the Bill of the present promoters, it would be much more reasonable and much more intelligent to refer the Bill back to them so as to enable them to bring up next year a measure based on their proposals—[Cries of "Divide, divide"]—because it was quite clear that the present proposals were not theirs at all. They had heard from the hon. Member for the City of London and others the absolute necessity of preventing snatch legislation. They had been repeatedly told that it was always advisable when there was a sudden change in public opinion that another opportunity should be given to the electorate to come to a decision on the new policy. He suggested, therefore, that they were only taking what was usually termed a reasonable position —a conservative position—when they asked the House to reject a Bill which was repudiated by its original promoters and was now promoted by those who intended to alter its character entirely.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed upon Monday next, at a quarter past Eight of the clock.

---

## ADMINISTRATIVE COUNTY OF LONDON AND DISTRICT ELECTRIC POWER BILL [BY ORDER].

Order for Second Reading read and discharged, Bill withdrawn.

---

## SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES).

Postponed Proceeding on Motion made on consideration of Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £11,117,751, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office, including Telegraphs."

Which Motion was, "That Item A be reduced by £100,"—(*Mr. Annan Bryce.*)—resumed.

Question again proposed, "That Item A be reduced by £100."

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

---

## POLITICAL PENSIONS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

Clause 1:—

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, and objection being taken to further Proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday, 3rd June.

Adjourned at six minutes after Eleven o'clock.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Friday*, 10*th May*, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

## *PETITIONS.*

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Boyndie, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### FRENCH IMMIGRANTS (RELIGIOUS ORDERS).

Petition from Inverary, for inquiry; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Galashiels, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against; from Bungay; Doncaster; Folkestone; Staines; and, Sydenham; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petitions for legislation; from Barnstaple; Barton-upon-Irwell; Blackburn; and, York; to lie upon the Table.

### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from Walsall, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### TEINDS, ETC. (SCOTLAND).

Return [presented 9th May] to be printed. [No. 146.]

### CHARITY COMMISSIONERS (AGRICULTURAL LAND).

Return [presented 9th May] to be printed. [No. 148.]

### EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).

Copy presented, of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1905–6, Forty-second Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 149.]

### CLYDE PORTS (VESSELS ENTERING, ETC.).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th April; *Mr. Ainsworth*]; to lie upon the Table.

### ULTIMUS HÆRES (SCOTLAND) (ACCOUNT AND LIST OF ESTATES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th May; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 147.]

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

### **Postal Service—Relatives in the same Office.**

MR. DUNCAN SCHWANN (Cheshire, Hyde): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that on 1st March, 1901, it was officially stated that exceptions to the regulations prohibiting the relatives of supervising officials receiving appointment at the same office were only made owing to the absence of any suitable person in the office, and that no mention was made of the sex of the officials, and in view of the fact that females are exempt from the operation of the rule, he will state the reason for compelling a female telegraphist at Brighton to remove to Worthing, owing to her father being an overseer in the Brighton postal department; and whether he will consider her repeated applications to return to her home, in view of his recent decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The officer referred to was transferred from Brighton in 1900 under the regulations then in force. These regulations have since been modified, but the modification has not been applied retrospectively, and no opportunity has yet occurred of re-transferring the officer in question to Brighton. Her case is being borne in mind, and her transfer will be arranged as soon as an opportunity occurs of doing so without injustice to others.

### Smithfield Post Office.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the Post Office acquired the upper portion of the premises at Smithfield Market branch office three months since, and that nothing has been done to place this additional accommodation at the disposal of the staff, he will, in view of the insanitary state of the present basement, give instructions to proceed quickly with the work of improvement.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Certain legal arrangements must be completed before a beginning can be made with the structural alterations required to adapt the upper portion of the Post Office building in Smithfield Market for official purposes. It is hoped that all outstanding questions will be settled shortly and a commencement made with the alterations, which are of an extensive character.

### Deductions from Probate Grant to County Mayo.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, could he give the particulars of the different items which go to make up the sum of £2,300 which has been deducted by the Treasury from the probate grant payable to the Mayo County Council in respect of land purchase.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The sum deducted in 1907 from the Death Duty grant payable to county Mayo was £1,292 16s. 1d.

The sum deducted is made us as follows:

| | £. |
|---|---|
| Drawn under the Irish Land Act, 1903— | |
| Arrears of annuities . . | 65 |
| Unearned dividend on issues of stock . . | 776 |
| Advance dividend . . | 446 |
| Interest due but not received . . . . | 507 |
| Unproductive balance . | 294 |
| | 2,088 |
| Less—repaid to Guarantee Fund under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891 . . . . | 795 |
| | £1,293 |

### Revenue raised from Taxes.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state, for the year 1906-7, the amount of revenue raised by taxes, distinguishing the revenue raised by permanent enactment from the revenue raised by temporary enactment, with the totals of each.

*Answered by Mr. Runciman:—*

## Revenue raised by Taxes, 1906–7.

| | Revenue raised | | | Temporary Duties. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | By Permanent Enactment. | By Temporary Enactment. | Total. | | |
| | £ | £ | £ | | |
| Customs :— | | | | | |
| (*a*) Paid to the Exchequer - | †25,685,000 | 7,245,000 | 32,930,000 | The whole of the Tea Duty<br>4d. per pound on unmanufactured tobacco, with proportionate increases on cigars and manufactured tobacco | These Temporary Duties are, in the absence of further legislation, in operation to 1st July, 1907. |
| (*b*) Paid to Local Taxation Accounts, &c. - - - | 184,706 | — | 184,706 | | |
| | 25,869,706 | 7,245,000 | 33,114,706 | 1s. per barrel on beer<br>6d. per gallon on spirits | |
| Excise :— | | | | | |
| (*a*) Paid to the Exchequer - | 27,860,000 | 2,490,000 | 30,350,000 | 1s. per barrel on beer | |
| (*b*) Paid to Local Taxation Accounts, &c. - - - | 5,353,689 | — | 5,353,689 | 6d. per gallon on spirits | |
| | 33,213,689 | 2,490,000 | 35,703,689 | | |
| Estate, &c., Duties :— | | | | | |
| (*a*) Paid to the Exchequer - | 14,400,000 | — | 14,400,000 | | |
| (*b*) Paid to Local Taxation Accounts, &c. - - - | 4,684,032 | — | 4,684,032 | | |
| | 19,084,032 | — | 19,084,032 | | |
| Stamps - - - - - - | 7,950,000 | — | 7,950,000 | | |
| Land Tax - - - - - - | 710,000 | — | 710,000 | | |
| House Duty - - - - - | 1,890,000 | — | 1,890,000 | | |
| Property and Income Tax - - | — | 31,600,000 | 31,600,000 | The whole of the tax at 1s. in the £ on 5th April 1907. | |
| | 88,717,427 | 41,335,000 | 130,052,427 | | |

---

Including proceeds of the Coal Duty, which was repealed as from the 1st November, 1906.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement of Henry Sorahan.

MR. THOMAS F. SMYTH (Leitrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Henry Sorahan, for his farm at Cloonohill, on the estate of Dr. Dick, in the county of Leitrim; and, as this estate has been sold, if arrangements will be made to have this tenant reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have inquired into the application referred to, and have decided to take no action upon it.

### Names and Occupations of Irish Deputy-Lieutenants.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will consent to the issue of a Return showing the names and occupations of the 666 deputy-lieutenants of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) There is no official record of the occupations of deputy-lieutenants. The names of these gentlemen are set out, by counties, in Thom's Official Directory. I do not see that any useful purpose would be served by the issue of a Parliamentary Return giving the names.

### Former Occupation of Irish Resident Magistrates.

MR. VINCENT (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can see his way to re-issue the list of resident magistrates, adding a column to show the previous occupation of each.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) A Return, presented in pursuance of an order of this House in 1895 shows, amongst other things, the former vocation of resident magistrates then serving. (Parliamentary Paper, No. 262, of Session 1895). If the hon. Member should see fit to move for a continuation of that Return I will offer no objection to its being granted.

### Religious Denominations of Irish Officials.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, as no official record is available as to the denominations to which they belong, he can state the names of the seventeen judges of the High Court, twenty-one county court judges, including five recorders, thirty-four lieutenants of counties and cities, forty-one Crown solicitors, and thirty-six clerks of the Crown and peace, with the counties to which those in the last four classes are attached.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I should be quite willing to give a Return containing the information asked for if it could be shown that any useful purpose would be served. The information is given in full in Thom's Official Directory and other publications.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the names of the present members of the Privy Council in Ireland; and whether there is any record as to their religious opinions.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The number of members of the Privy Council in Ireland is seventy, and their names are given in Thom's Official Directory and similar publications. There is no record of the religious opinions of Privy Councillors.

### Sale of Estate of Mr. J. Martin, of Bryanstown.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. James Martin, of Bryanstown, county Longford, who is the owner of a farm of 150 acres of land at Clogher, county Roscommon, is willing to sell the same to the Estates Commissioners for £3,000 for sub-division amongst smaller holdings; and will the Commissioners direct an inspection and offer to be made to Mr. Martin.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the estate referred to was recently sold to Mr. Martin as tenant-purchaser under the Act of 1903. The Commissioners are not aware that Mr. Martin is prepared to sell the holding, but in any event they are precluded by the Act of 1891 from making any further advances for the purchase of the holding so long as it is subject to the repayment of the existing purchase annuity.

### Receivable Orders issued to Mrs. Ellen Farrell, of Clonevit.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Irish Land Commission, through their solicitor, Mr. Franks, have made a claim on Mrs. Ellen Farrell, of Clonevit, Moydon, on the Conry estate, for two sums of interest amounting to £3 4s. 3d., from 1st November, 1906, to 21st February, 1907, at 3¼ per cent., which means an overcharge on this woman of 9s. 6d. on the instalments; and will he direct that the amount be properly calculated and a new form sent to her.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that on 24th November, 1904, Mrs. Ellen Farrell signed two purchase agreements. In one case the purchase money was £108 and in the other £222. The purchaser covenanted to pay interest in lieu of rent at 3¼ per cent. from the date of the agreements. The purchase moneys were afterwards reduced by agreement to £100 and £200, respectively, as from the 21st January, 1907. The receivable orders which have been issued to the purchaser have been calculated at the correct amounts.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Thomas Keenan.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in case good solvent sureties are tendered for Thomas Keenan's instalments for the farm at Mornnie, on the Cusack estate, from which he was evicted, he will be admitted as sole tenant in order to satisfy local feeling in this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are at present inquiring into the circumstances of this case with the view of effecting a settlement. They will consider the suggestion contained in the Question.

### Army Pensions—Case of Thomas Murphy.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of Thomas Murphy, now living at Ballyclare, county Longford, on a small pension, who fought throughout the entire Crimean War in 1854 and 1855; and will he direct that this man's pension be increased so as to enable him to refrain from having to work, being now in his eighty-fourth year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is not possible to trace this case without the name of the regiment from which the man was discharged. If the hon. Member will kindly furnish this information, and, if possible, the date of discharge, inquiry shall be made into the case.

### Army Pensions—Case of John Tracy.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will consider the case of John Tracy, late of the 55th Regiment, who served in the British Army for over twenty years and took part in the Indian Mutiny, including the Relief of Lucknow, the Mussura Campaign of 1868, and who is now seventy years of age, and is living in poor circumstances near Arva, with a view to increasing his pension to 2s. per day during the remainder of his life.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) This man is in receipt of 1s. 3d. a day, which is the highest rate of pension for which he is eligible under the regulation which applies.

---

## OLD AGE PENSIONS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. W. H. LEVER (Cheshire, Wirral), in moving the Second Reading, stated that the fact that he had the responsibility of performing this duty was due entirely to the fortunes of the ballot. This was a most important measure, and if effect were given to the proposal it would involve the expenditure of enormous sums of money. He acknowledged that he had derived great advantage from having the opportunity of referring to previous Bills on the same subject brought forward by the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire. The measure was drafted on the lines of those Bills. Some slight alterations had been made, the most important being the introduction of the principle of graduation

—if he might use such a term—in the commencement of the pensions. The object of the Bill was to provide old-age pensions for all persons over sixty-five years of age, but in order to bring the scheme into operation it was proposed that in the first year it should only apply to persons of seventy-five years of age and upwards; in the second year to persons of seventy years of age and upwards, and in the third year to all persons of sixty-five years of age and upwards. This graduation would serve two purposes. It would enable the President of the Local Government Board to perfect the machinery of the Department without friction, and it would enable the nation to provide the means for paying the pensions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government were favourable to the scheme, as was shown by their declarations on the subject, and he asked the House to affirm the all-important principle of universal old-age pensions. The financial burden on the nation should be started in the way that people were best able to bear it. The position of Chancellors of the Exchequer in the past with regard to old-age pensions reminded him of the husband who was always complaining that his wife's continual cry was "Money! money! money!" A friend asked him, "What does she want it for, and what does she do with it." "I have not the slightest idea," answered the husband, "but I take precious good care that she never gets any." Chancellors of the Exchequer had certainly taken precious good care that no money was ever available for the purpose of old age pensions. This was not a Party question, for all sides of the House were agreed that it was desirable to do something in this direction. The hon. Member for Preston, however, was going to oppose the Bill on the ground that the country had not had an opportunity of expressing an opinion in regard to old age pensions. He (Mr. Lever) maintained that there was no topic on which the country had so often and so emphatically expressed an opinion. Prime Ministers and Cabinet Ministers had dealt with it in their election addresses for more than ten years, and the country had clearly and unmistakably expressed its satisfaction with the principle. The reason actuating the hon. Member for Preston was that he believed not so much what was in his own Amendment as that which he expressed in a recent speech, where he declared that old age pensions should be provided by employers and employees jointly, by habits of thrift and by insurance. There were, however, grave objections to the hon. Member's proposal, for it was a very difficult thing to say who were employers and who were employees. The direct employer of labour was the servant of the public, and was really the employee of the consumer. At the dictate of the public the employer engaged or dismissed men according to the demand for his goods. He was no more than a straw floating down the stream of demand. Then there was only one fund out of which the employer could pay old age pensions, that being the long service and devotion of his employees. A great many firms and some railway companies had provident schemes, but small employers had no fund out of which old-age pensions could be paid. The demand from the public which regulated employment made such a system of pensions as that proposed by the hon. Member most unfair and most unjust. There was an obligation on the part of the State to do for individual citizens what individual citizens could not do for themselves. Then again the employee's position was to be considered. He might have done his duty to the State and he might have a large family. The placing out in life of all his children had to be considered, and for that reason alone he might be compelled to give up his old employment with his firm. He must not neglect the future advancement in life of his children, and he might not always be able to keep up the insurance money. With regard to thrift he was not quite sure that that was the largest virtue that could be asked of citizenship. He believed there were many virtues far more useful to this country to cultivate than that of thrift. The man or woman endeavouring to save for themselves would at one period or another of their lives have to consider their children from the point of view of sickness or advancement in life. Was a father or mother going to say "We shall hold on to our old age pensions, we cannot call a doctor, and we will at all costs, whether the children get on in life or not, keep up the old age pension premium, so that in old age we may have something to fall back upon?" No father or mother worthy of the name would take that view. The narrow margin there was between income and expenditure in so many occupations for those who had children to maintain made the thrift line or the insurance line impossible, and to put such a problem before the people of this wealthy country was not right. He knew of a case in a village in England which illustrated his point. He would not use any name, but he would give the woman to whom he referred the name of Betty Jones. She and her husband were of the agricultural labouring class and never had more than 16s. a week. At one period the husband had no more than 12s. a week. They brought up twelve children. The girls went out to service and the boys to work on farms. They were reared in a little cottage consisting of a but and a ben and all were doing well. For thirty years of her life this old lady declared she never set eyes on a sovereign piece. Now the husband was dead, and friends and neighbours had to keep her from going into the workhouse. Could she have saved anything for an old age pension? All would agree that she and her husband had done their duty to the State. From a national point of view she had fulfilled her duty to the State in a higher manner by bringing up a family respectably than if she had saved any amount of money for thrift and exercised all the virtues in that direction. He remembered one remarkable example of thrift in the case of a wealthy man who was never known to give anything in his life. One day, however, he met a man in the village poorly shod and told him that if he went up to the house he would be given an old pair of boots which he had discarded. A few days later he saw the villager wearing a remarkably good-looking pair of boots, "Ah, John," said he, "where did you get those boots from?" "Oh, sir," was the reply, "they are the pair you told me to go and get!" "Well, I never," said the rich man, "I thought they were past mending! What did they cost you to mend?" "Half-a-crown," replied the new owner with satisfaction. "Look here then," rejoined the donor, "here is your half-crown and you can take them back to my house." They might say that Betty Jones was not thrifty and that the rich man was. He was not sure that they could defend the positions they had taken up in the way they had been accustomed to do even if it were possible to get people to keep up payments for insurance money during the active period of their lives. It was an exceptionally costly method. It was much more costly for the working man than for the master, because the premium was smaller and the collection was made weekly. The master could pay by cheque twice or four times a year, and the cost of the bank account and the price of the cheque practically represented the cost of collection. The insurance method by weekly payments was an extravagant one and one which ought not to be forced upon any person against his will. They looked to the State for a great many things, and he thought they must look to the State for old age pensions. He did not know if even the Member for Preston would say they had done wrong in giving children free education. There were duties devolving on the State, which were that the State should do for the individual citizen what it was out of the power of the individual citizen to do for himself. So soon as they arrived at the point where the citizen could not do a certain thing which was necessary for his future welfare and happiness or his present welfare and safety, at that point the State ought to step in. As children grew up they paid back to the State in the form of rates and taxes the money that was spent on their education. Free education was no gift; it was excellent business for the State to bring these children up, to make them good citizens and able to carry on the work of the State. There was a great obligation upon the State to give old age pensions—an obligation to a manly, independent nation which respected itself, and was not going to be under any obligation to any section of its citizens. The Bill provided that the pension should be personally applied for every week, and that, he thought, would settle who would receive five shillings per week. To the poor man five shillings a week was all important, and he would not mind how long he had to stand at the end of a queue in order to get it. On the other hand, the man whose time was valuable, whatever his position was, was not likely to go every week at a certain hour and apply for his five shillings. From that reason alone it was a little difficult to tell what the scheme would cost. Commencing at the age of seventy-five years and upwards, excluding paupers and criminals, and making some allowance for those who, it was believed, would never apply for pensions at all, he calculated that it would cost something between £5,000,000 and £6,500,000; commencing at seventy years of age and upwards it would cost from £12,000,000 to £13,500,000; while commencing at sixty-five years it would cost from £18,000,000 to £20,000,000 per annum. He did not vouch for these figures; he only gave them by way of illustration. How was the money going to be raised? In considering this matter he had come across the very curious anomaly that there were only two classes of people in the United Kingdom who paid exactly the same rate in the pound in Imperial taxation. The one was the man with 20s. and under per week, and the other was the man with £1,000,000 capital and over. When they found such was the case he thought it was clear that something was wrong. That sprang from the way in which taxes were collected, from the system of indirect taxation through customs and excise and direct taxation through the income-tax. If they supposed that the working man, his wife and children, had as good appetites as the well to do, and, as they knew for a fact, that the working classes had larger families on the average, they found that the 30s. per head, which was the Government revenue from excise and custom duties, was £7 10s. per family, provided that the man was not a teetotaler and liked his pipe, and that the wife and children liked a cup of tea or coffee. If it was right to assume that their consumption of these things was equal to the average, then it was clear that these men paid £7 10s. a year in excise and customs duties, which was 3s. in the pound, or over. The millionaire paid 1s. in the pound. He also paid death duties—10 per cent. on £1,000,000—and insurance for these death duties would cost about another 2s. in the pound, making a total of 3s. in the pound. These two classes, therefore, paid the same amount. How were they going to get the money for this scheme? He did not advocate tariff reform. If they were to have tariff reform he believed it would increase the 3s. paid by the working man to 5s. or 6s., and decrease the 3s. on the millionaire to 1s. or 1s. 6d., or less. To apply a form of taxes on food would simply act as if they took these poor people by the throat and held them and said, "Either pay these taxes or starve." No section of the community could be made permanently prosperous and happy or successful by any unjust system of taxation. All the Government ought to do was to see that the methods of taxation were fair and just to every section of the community, and that every citizen had equal opportunities by the application of the principle of payment of taxation in accordance with ability to pay, and in proportion to the wealth of the individual. The logic of that was that wealth required the most protection—by armies, navies, and so on—and therefore must pay the most. Therefore, he suggested that they should take a step away from indirect taxation, and rather extend the system of graduated income-tax. He was firmly convinced that that was the proper thing to do. If they wanted to provide money for old age pensions they should commence with an income-tax of twopence per pound on incomes of twenty shillings per week. By that measure the people of the country would know for all time what they were paying for. They did not know that at present. It was the only way they could make the system of taxation fair to all classes. Then there was no reason why they should stop at one shilling in the pound for a rich man. He did not desire to press it to its utmost limit, but he did not think a one-shilling tax would cripple rich men in their industries, investments, and so on. He believed if they omitted links in the chain of the graduated taxation, if they tried to leave one section of the community out, and did not embrace all, the whole fabric would fall to the ground. By omitting one link from the chain it would be possible on that account for the rich to pass the burden on to the poor, and so in the end to crush the poorest. They ought to recognise the principle that it was a fair method of taxation, in fact the only fair one, and that by no other means could they lay the burden equally on every section of the community. His desire was to make this Bill as simple as possible, and free from all taint of pauperism. It should be administered by the Local Government Board or the Registrar-General, who had an intimate knowledge of the question. The money must be paid through the Post Office or through the Registrar-General. But all these details could be discussed in Committee; what they desired was that the House should express its opinion on the Bill, so that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer came next year to fulfil the pledge he had given, he might know exactly the views of the House upon this great subject; and that when they approached the question they would do so with a desire to settle it, and get a great principle established for all time. It was not benevolence. If it were he did not think the manly independent working man would have anything to do with it, nor that the House of Commons would force it upon him. It was neither benevolence nor philanthropy. Benevolence and philanthropy were only a system of charity, and charity was the mother of pauperism. They wanted this scheme on a strict system of business. It was mere justice to the great masses of the people of the country, and he believed the Government was going to show what it meant. This Government had been returned on a programme of social reform. The country was ripe and eager for social reform. He was certain the result of the scheme would be to produce better citizens; he believed this 5s. a week would encourage thrift by giving a stimulus where at present there was blank despair. He moved the Second Reading of the Bill.

*SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) thought that they might all congratulate his hon. friend on his admirable speech; but still more that the ballot had given him the opportunity of placing before the House of Commons, so clearly the principle of a system of universal old age pensions, and he trusted that the House would have the opportunity of putting on record, once for all, their opinion on that principle. It seemed to him that the form in which the hon. Gentleman had recast the Bill which he himself had drafted six years ago would give the Government useful suggestions for the Bill which they had promised to bring in next year to deal with this question. The figures which the hon. Gentleman had given showed that the problem of dealing with the question step by step was not a very formidable one. Nothing had grown so rapidly as the intelligent public opinion on this question of old age pensions. He would like to draw attention to the immense advance which the subject had made as compared with the old days when it was discussed for the first time. Each debate had helped to clear away many fallacies. In the very last debate of importance on the subject before the general election, on 6th May, 1904, Mr. Cripps, who no longer sat in the House, made the frank admission that all the schemes for old age pensions based on the lines of inquisitorial investigation of past records or with income tests would be incentives to fraud, and that such tests and inquiries into private character were infinitely cruel and demoralising. He would allude for a moment to what had been the experience in New Zealand in regard to this question. In that country they had had an old age pension system based upon an income test for a number of years—since 1899—and even in that simple, almost idyllic community, where the application of such a test would be absolutely easy, compared with what it would be in the slums of London or great centres of population like Liverpool, Manchester, and Glasgow, it was found that it led to very serious frauds, which became so numerous that no later than 1905 an Act had to be passed which made the machinery of the Act much more stringent to enable the New Zealand Government to deal with those frauds. They were all aware of the differences between this country and New Zealand, but he would say that if it was found demoralising there, it would be found infinitely more demoralising here. What Mr. Cripps said in 1904 expressed the real point at which the House and the country had at last arrived, namely, that when they spoke of a pension they meant a pension which was to be given as a matter of right and easily obtainable by the simplest machinery the State could provide. Many inquiries had brought us to that point at last, and now we were in this position, that we had a Government in power with an irresistible majority, pledged to carry out that principle in a manner which was wholly divorced from the Poor Law or, at any rate, to lay in the present year the corner stones of the finance on which it should rest. There was no question upon which a mandate was given by the electors, and by the working-class electors especially, more definitely than upon this question. They knew that from Cabinet Ministers down to the humblest members of the Civil Service, they held their pensions, not as a charity or because of destitution, but as a right, and as a sort of deferred pay or annuity which was due to them. These men had turned their powers, possibly from more remunerative walks of life, to the use of the State, and this was the ground on which they received these pensions or deferred pay. Why not apply the same reasoning with infinitely greater force to those who worked with their hands? He wished to say, having studied this question for a very long period, that he had come to the conclusion that they could justify old age pensions on an economic basis and on the strictest economic grounds. Despite all the advantages which had been conferred by legislation on labour in its contest with capital, labour did not yet get its proper share of the wealth it created. They knew perfectly well that in all bargainings, whether it was for wages or whether it was for rent, the weaker side got the worst of the bargain and went to the wall. The worker, although he had the franchise and his trade organisation to help him, only got a bare margin over starvation and degradation in his struggle for existence with the united and entrenched forces of capital and landlordism. He never really secured the full living wage they wished to see. It was only the growing conviction of the more thoughtful and far-seeing employers that it was to their own interest, and that higher wages and better conditions paid for themselves in such an increased quantity and quality of work. It was therefore the duty of the State to redress this unfair balance. Old age pensions meant not only the making good by the State of what was due for loyal service, but securing to the workers when their labouring days were over that reasonable share of the wealth they created which had been far too long withheld. He put old age pensions very much on the same footing as the equalisation of rates. It was not, in his judgment, because of destitution and suffering in the East End of London, that rates were equalised, but as a debt due economically as well as morally by the State. He did not deny, he was far too much of an individualist to deny, that the highest ideal of all was to give every man and woman—whether as small holders on the land or as members of prosperous productive co-operative societies, or whatever they were—the opportunity of earning wages or making profits sufficient to provide, not only for the healthful bringing up of their families and those dependent upon them, but also for laying aside something to make happy and contented their old age. Failing that opportunity, however, it was only justice that the State should make a provision for its citizens as a right and therefore free of the taint of pauperism. In the old days he was a supporter of the scheme of Canon Blackley by which the young man was to be encouraged, not to say coerced, into putting by a certain sum—a nest egg which, when it grew would form an insurance for the provision of a pension for his old age. If such a scheme had been possible to adopt it would have been an enormous benefit to this country. In supporting the proposals of this Bill he wholly denied that they were acting contrary to the principle upon which the great thrift and friendly societies were established. On the contrary, they regarded the splendid work of the societies as one of the greatest assistance in this cause, and by this reform they wanted to strengthen and not to weaken it. He believed with Mr. Charles Booth, that if they gave a man some solid foothold of hope that if he saved he would have something in the end worth saving for, that hope was the greatest of stimulants to human motives. He had recently talked over this subject with one of the ablest social workers in this country who was now carrying on investigations in the North of England with a view to laying the results before the Poor Law Commission, and was assured that these investigations tended to show that Mr. Charles Booth's view was sound, and that the endowment of old age by a pension given as a right would strengthen human nature and strengthen the motives for thrift more than anything else. What could help human nature to do the best for itself more than to lift from the human mind that demoralising and intolerable dread and sense of despair, that a man in middle life had the feeling that he was compelled to see little by little the destruction of his savings, to divest himself of every shred of the money he had laid by, in order to qualify himself by total destitution for the pitiable and degrading last refuge of human existence in the workhouse? His hon. friend the Member for Wirral had touched upon the question of the evils which could result from over-saving, and over-eagerness to put by money and the result it might have upon the physique of the family, and he did not wish to labour that point, but he did hope that hon. Members in every part of the House who were not familiar with Mr. Rowntree's book on Poverty in York and had not studied the facts he proved by analysis of the budgets of the poor in York, would do so. Hon. Members would realise what it really meant when they considered that in the case of a man who was of the very best type of the thrifty and deserving class of working man earning 20s. a week, and a teetotaler who paid 1s. a week for his friendly society, that man was only left with the sum for the food of his family of five of 11s. a week, or a sum which was 4s. 5d. below the sum which the Local Government Board insisted upon as the minimum dietary scale for the same number of persons in the workhouses in York. That showed the folly of insisting that these poor people ought to qualify themselves for an old-age pension by proving that they had made savings by thrift. He would also very respectfully suggest to Members of the House another source of information of great importance, and that was the valuable statement appended by the late Mr. Lecky to the Report of one of the Committees, in the course of which he said what might seem a paradox, that saving in one sense might be the cruellest form of improvidence. They had to consider the position of the working classes of this country not under any ideal and theoretical conception of their position and conditions of employment and of the income they could earn and the savings they might make. They had to consider the actual social situation as it existed and to provide a remedy which in their opinion and in the opinion of some of the greatest thinkers and reformers would strengthen and not weaken manhood and self-reliance and give the highest encouragement to move towards a better social state. Two classes were not affected by this Bill at first. To those who were well off and would be better off by saving, or to the wastrel who cared for nothing but the coarse brutal indulgence of the moment, the guarantee of 5s. a week at the age of sixty-five would have very little effect one way or the other. The real thing to consider was the meaning of this Bill and its effect on the vast intermediate struggling class of small earnings whose employment was uncertain, whose instincts made them long for better positions and greater security; who were capable of having brought before their imagination a happier and more hopeful outlook. Would the certainty of a pension make them less industrious, or would it change the sense of hopeless struggling against despair, with the workhouse at the end, to the tangible foothold on modest happiness free from disgrace, and where the holiest influence of the world, family affection, would have full play? He was glad to second the adoption of this Bill. He regarded these social problems from the point of view that this House was endeavouring to throw open the doors for human effort. He was an individualist, and wished to see these people given an opportunity by self-help and enlightened education to build up a state of society in which this pitiful state of things was no more to be allowed to go on, but would be got rid of altogether by this system. He regarded an old age pension scheme not as a complete and final social solution for the country, but rather as a temporary expedient, a sort of crutch for the urgent necessities of their social condition which might operate as a stimulus to well doing now and to a better use of the opportunities which he hoped an enlightened Parliament would place within reach in the future.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this Bill be read a second time."—(*Mr. Lever.*)

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) in moving "That this House declines to proceed further with a measure which would enormously add to the national expenditure until the country has had an opportunity of saying whether it is willing to bear the necessary burden of taxation" said that he realised as every body must the immense importance of old-age pensions. But on this occasion the House had not to discuss an abstract Resolution in favour of old-age pensions, but the provisions of a particular Bill which if carried would go automatically to a Standing Committee. This Bill gave a pension of 5s. a week to everybody, whether rich or poor, deserving or undeserving. In order to mitigate the evil effect of the Bill his hon. friend the Member for Wirral had argued that the rich would not trouble to attend to draw their pensions. But in practice it would be impossible to compel enfeebled old people to attend every week to draw their pensions.

MR. W. H. LEVER pointed out that there was a clause providing that if it were certified that it would be injurious to the health of an applicant to attend a substitute could be appointed to draw the pension.

*MR. HAROLD COX said it was quite sufficient for his argument to say that personal attendance could not be enforced in each case, and therefore they were bound to assume that the vast majority of the people who became entitled to a pension of 5s. a week would proceed to draw it. After three years it would cost the country £26,000,000, and he would like to point out that it would very quickly cost a good deal more, because it would soon be discovered that 5s. a week was quite insufficient to live upon, and also that people under sixty-five would also require pensions. All this money was to be paid by the tax-payer. No Member of the House had a mandate for such a thing as this. He challenged any Member to rise and say that he told his constituents that he was prepared to support a Bill for old-age pensions that was going to cost the country £26,000,000 a year.

MR. W. H. LEVER: I think I did.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): And so did I.

*MR. HAROLD COX said that at all events the Government were very careful about committing themselves in this matter. They abstained from committing themselves to old age pensions. They did commit themselves to a reduction of taxation, and if this Bill were passed there could never be a reduction of taxation. One of the favourite arguments used during the election was that the late Government gained the election of 1900 on a particular issue, and then pushed forward unpopular measures dealing with education and licensing. That was universally condemned. But that was a venal offence compared with this, because, though what the late Government did was outside their pledges, it was not in violation of them; but what the hon. Member asked His Majesty's Government to do was to pass a Bill which would prevent them carrying out their pledges to reduce taxation. On the basis of our present system of taxation every man who voted for this Bill voted for an increase on the income-tax of 50 per cent. and for doubling the duties on tea and sugar. His hon. friend below him wished the House to commit themselves on this particular Bill as an instruction to the Chancellor of the Exchequer next year.

MR. W. H. LEVER said he asked the House to commit itself to the principle of old age pensions. The House on this particular Bill did not commit itself to an expenditure of £26,000,000. It committed itself to £5,000,000, £10,000,000, and £15,000,000.

*MR. HAROLD COX said it was clearly not the scheme which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had in his mind when he made his Budget speech, because the right hon. Gentleman had since stated that he hoped to reduce the income-tax in the future and abolish the sugar tax. The hon. Member for Wirral had told the House that he was in favour of extending the income-tax downwards. He agreed with his hon, friend as to the necessity of extending the income-tax downwards. Our present taxes on tea and sugar were grossly unfair to the poorest classes of our taxpayers, and personally he wanted to get rid of this unfair taxation on the poorest people. It was said recently by one hon. Member in the House that if they wanted old age pensions they must pay for them. The Labour Party had a scheme for the imposition of a super-tax on the incomes of the rich. But in the evidence given by Sir Henry Primrose before the Select Committee presided over by his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean it was stated that a super-tax on incomes over £5,000 ranging between 6d. to 2s. in the £ would only yield £6,500,000. Where was the rest of the money to come from for old age pensions? It could only come from taxes on commodities, and any general system of taxation on commodities meant inevitably the abandonment of free trade. Nearly all our taxes on commodities at present were partially protective, such as the taxes on sugar, tobacco, and cocoa. Directly hon. Members put this issue to the country the people would be led astray, as other nations had been, to choose the broad and easy path, rather than take the narrow and difficult path, and to plump for taxes on commodities instead of for direct taxation. The House was invited by an hon. Member who professed to be a free trader to steer straight for protection. He was quite certain that his hon. friend had no desire to lead the country to protection, but that would be the direct consequence of his proposal. He observed that this very suggestion had been kindly made to this country by one of our Colonial visitors. The other day Sir William Lyne, one of the delegates from Australia to the Colonial Conference, suggested that we should tax foreign foodstuffs for the benefit of the Colonies, and incidentally to provide old age pensions at home. The House no doubt might be told that Australia succeeded in getting old age pensions under her protective system. No doubt Sir William Lyne would point to the success of their system in Australia; but it was very easy for Australia to pay old age pensions up to £1,500,000 a year, because they got towards the cost of their Navy £4,000,000 or £5,000,000 a year from free-trade England. Let them consider how the system worked in Australia. The Australian system tried to discriminate between incomes, and broke down in three Colonies where the attempt was made. In Victoria the system was on the whole carefully administered. They began with a pension of 10s. a week, but the burden on the taxpayer was found to be too heavy, and the pensions were cut down to 8s. They also compelled children to contribute towards the support of their parents. There was also the wise provision that pensions were not confined to any particular age; a pension was given to a man at any age when he needed it on the ground of infirmity. In Victoria there was a cripple twenty-seven years of age in receipt of a pension. Moreover, they refused pensions to drunkards. But this Bill would give a man a pension no matter how great a drunkard he was. It would give a pension to everybody, providing they had been successful enough to escape six months imprisonment with hard labour. Everybody would be entitled to 5s. a week, however vicious their lives might have been. In his Budget speech the Chancellor of the Exchequer said he looked forward to a reduction of Poor Law expenditure as a result of giving old age pensions. But that anticipation was negatived by the experience of Australia. The registrar of old age pensions in Victoria on being asked what had been the effect of old age pensions on the vote for charitable institutions, said it had made practically no difference whatever. The inspector of charities said—

> "It has not affected the number of persons relieved in any way. The places of those who go out of the charitable institutions are filled up at once, and the average is exactly the same as it was before the Act was passed."

Other witnesses went on to say—

> "Old-age pensioners were far better looked after in institutions than when left to themselves. It is a cruel kindness to give some aged persons pensions. They are not fit to have pensions, there is no one to look after them, they simply go into the hospitals at intervals to get fixed up, and then go out again."

The honorary treasurer of the Melbourne Ladies' Benevolent Society was asked whether poverty was increasing or decreasing in Victoria, and replied—

> "We do not think that poverty is increasing, but we think the tendency to ask for assistance is increasing."

They had the same story from New South Wales. The registrar of old-age pensions there stated that the anticipated relief to the pressure on charitable institutions had not been realised. The acting Government statistician of New South Wales had given figures showing a great increase in the expenditure on charitable institutions, and said—

> "It was anticipated that when the old age Pensions Act was passed it would have the effect of relieving the pressure upon charitable institutions, but the figures given clearly indicate that such is not the case."

Dealing with this matter in their Report the Members of the Commission made the strange statement that there had not been yet sufficient time to produce any marked evidence of the change; but unfortunately such evidence of any change that had occurred was wholly in the wrong direction, it was all towards an increase of cost. The officer administering the charity vote in New South Wales said—

> "I wish to impress upon the Commission that many of the persons to whom we have granted assistance were quite satisfied to rely upon themselves until they were referred by the old age pensions authorities to our department. When they found they could not establish their claim to an old age pension they at the same time became aware that other means of relief were available to them."

In other words the establishment of old age pensions in New South Wales had actually stimulated these persons to come forward and ask for Poor Law relief. It was interesting to find that the Australian evidence declared that the system there had not encouraged thrift. The superintendent of the Melbourne Benevolent Asylum said—

> "I think that the payment of these pensions has a tendency to increase pauperism."

*Mr. Harold Cox.*

One of the witnesses before that Commission, the registrar of old-age pensions for New South Wales, gave a pitiful instance of an old lady who had struggled on for many years trying to support herself, and did so until she had reached the end of her little capital. He said—

> "She was a spinster, apparently with few or no friends, and had been fighting for life with her back to the wall for many years; she only came out into the open when she was driven to do so by necessity. She was refused a pension because she was not qualified by age."

The system of fixed age and income inevitably led to dishonesty. There was overwhelming evidence of this. The New South Wales registrar, quoting from the New Zealand Report, said that New Zealand had to revise the whole of her pension list, on account of the undue confidence which was placed in the statements of pensioners at the commencement of the Act. Numerous instances were given of persons with large property pretending to be poor in order to get pensions. A woman received a pension on the recommendation of a man who testified to her moral and reputable life. It subsequently transpired that she was living with the man as his mistress, though married to another man. On the other hand many respectable people suffered in silence rather than undergo the humiliation of being cross-examined about their past and present lives. There was strong evidence also of children evading their obligation to keep their parents although possessed of ample means. That reminded him of the lady alluded to by the hon. Member for Wirral. She must have been extremely thrifty to have brought up so many children, and their obvious duty was to keep her now. The Australian Commissioners proposed that a penalty should be imposed for supplying an old age pensioner with intoxicating drink. Presumably, pensioners were then to go about marked in such a way as to make it known that they were pensioners, and must be deprived of the liberty of taking a glass of beer. It was impossible to urge that a man was entitled of right to a pension, and at the same time to deprive him of a liberty that other men enjoyed. What was the abstract case put forward by the advocates of this scheme? It was that as a pension was given to soldiers and civil servants, so also it ought to be given to those in other employment. The Government paid these pensions because it was part of their contract as employers, and because on the whole by that means they obtained the service at a lower rate. It was part of the bargain between the State and their employees. The State paid a pension to its civil servants, simply because it was the employer. Many private employers did the same. He contended that the hon. Member for Wirral had an obligation to those whom he employed, but he certainly had no obligation to give an old age pension to those he did not employ. Let them take the case of two competing tradesmen in the same street. Not only were they not helping one another, but they were hindering one another. How unfair it would be that, when the time arrived for one of them to take a pension, the other should be called upon to help to provide him with that pension. The whole idea of old age pensions was to set up a right, but that must depend on the recognition of a corresponding obligation. If it was said that there was a right to old age pensions, then they ought to specify on whom the obligation to pay those pensions rested. If the obligation rested anywhere it rested on the employer. Certain people said—"Why do you oppose this; it is only a readjustment? You have got to keep the old people somehow." But let them see where that argument would land them. People also must have bread every day. Why make them pay for the bread they wanted? Why not readjust matters—buy the bread out of the taxes of the country, and then distribute the bread all round the houses? It was only readjustment. Why not carry the principle still further? We must all have clothing. Why put women to the trouble of choosing their own clothes? Why not put millinery and dressmaking bills on the Consolidated Fund and distribute the clothing to each house? Possibly a little more readjustment would then be necessary; and perhaps that was the reason why his hon. friend would postpone this proposal until women had votes. Again, how could there be a right to old age pensions if they were only to begin at the age of sixty-five? [AN HON. MEMBER: Civil servants.] Civil servants were under contract to receive pensions. The proposition was that up to the age of sixty-five nobody was to receive a pension, even though starving; but after that age everybody was to receive the pension of 5s. at other people's expense.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): They need not claim it.

*MR. HAROLD COX agreed that was so; but they had the right to claim it, and if it was a right, then he thought his hon. friend was perfectly justified in saying that the pension must be given to everybody. The absurdity followed that people with £50 a week were to have a right to claim an extra 5s. a week, if they wanted it. That alone condemned the proposal. Then again, if it was a right, it could not be dependent upon character. Everybody must be entitled to it, however bad a character and however bad a citizen he might have been. He might have spent his life not in helping his country but in injuring his country, by his own vicious conduct; he might have been an idle, drunken blackguard, yet, when he reached the age of sixty-five, he was entitled to draw 5s. a week out of the pockets of hard-working, sober, and thrifty men. This was what his hon. friend called social reform. He contended that if they were going to establish old age pensions on the basis of right, they must also be established on the basis of contribution. There could not be a right unless there was contribution; and he was glad to say that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had always insisted that old age pensions without contribution were impossible. He might also ask, if it was a right, how did they fix the pension at 5s.? When there was a contribution, then the right naturally arose out of the contribution. Each man paid in so much, and one got out in proportion to what he paid in. But if they were going to say that there was a right to old age pensions apart from contribution why fix the amount at 5s. any more than 10s. or £10 or £100? There was just as much right to the one as the other. Without contributions old age pensions were not a right but a charity. They were another form of outdoor relief. That brought him to the German system, which presented many great advantages. At any rate, as far as he had been able to ascertain, the

Germans were thoroughly convinced that it was a sound, useful, and popular scheme. The essence of the German system was compulsory insurance against the various risks of life. In conversation with the head of the Poor Law Department in Berlin he told him what was proposed in England. The head of the Department looked at him and said, "Will you repeat that statement?" and he did. "Well," he said, "if I did not see you were so serious I would not believe that the English people would be so foolish as to give old age pensions without contribution." The essence of the German system, as he had said, was compulsory insurance, and it began with insurance for sickness in the year 1883; compulsory insurance for accidents followed in 1884, and old age and infirmity insurance in 1888. The system had been tested for a sufficiently long period. The accident insurance was paid entirely by the employer; the sickness insurance was paid, one-third by the employer and two-thirds by the workmen; the old age and infirmity insurance half and half, with a subsidy of £2 10s. a year from the State to each pension. The old age pension, properly so called, did not begin until the age of seventy; the infirmity pension rightly began at any age, provided that the man was infirm and was unable to earn more than one-third of the average wage. The official description of the old age pension was that it "formed an addition to the earnings of the old, but not incapacitated, working people, and made some amends for the diminished vigour of age." "Infirmity pensions offered compensation for the loss of capacity to work." It was interesting to note that under the German system old age pensions properly so called were rapidly disappearing, and were being replaced by infirmity pensions. That was another proof that an old age pension at a fixed age was an absurdity and could not last, because some men were quite young at the age of seventy and others were old at forty. There was a surrender value in case of death to the benefit of one of the relations. The contributions of workmen towards their own old age pensions were invested largely in building workmen's houses. The system was sound in equity as well as in economics; it was better to compel an individual to pay for his own pension than to compel him as a taxpayer to pay for somebody else's. He contended that it was part of the duty of life to make provision for old age. The State compelled education, surely it had also the right to compel thrift. He knew, of course, that a system of compulsion involved many difficulties, and a great amount of bureaucratic supervision, which Englishmen, many of them, resented. But he would point out to hon. Members below the gangway opposite that these forms of interference by Government were necessary concomitants of Socialistic legislation. They could not have Socialism without tyranny.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): You have it now.

*MR. HAROLD COX said that was why he believed that the English people, when they came to scan this question more closely, would be content to rely on their own system of private effort, combined with their historic system of Poor Law. As a matter of fact, the demand for old age pensions had become more brisk during the last few years, in which there had been immense progress made towards supplying old age pensions. Numbers of voluntary schemes had proved successful. The London and North Western Railway Company had a very valuable pension scheme.

MR. WARDLE (Stockport): Which is insolvent.

*MR. HAROLD COX said the pensions were paid; and he imagined that behind that insolvent scheme, if it were insolvent, were the shareholders of the company who would see that the pensions were paid. He might refer to two schemes, both of which were started by Members of the House, and both of which were paying large pensions at the present time. In Colman's many workmen were receiving pensions ranging from 8s. to 17s. 6d. per week; foremen's pensions ranged from 21s. to 55s. per week, and many widows also received pensions. Reckitt's paid pensions ranging from 10s. to 23s. a week. He would like to ask the House whether, if this Bill were passed, these admirable pension schemes would be brought to an end; or, in the other alternative, would the employers who were discharging this honourable duty be taxed in order to relieve other employers who had not undertaken the duty? His hon. friend had pointed out that a great many people had not regular employment, which made the establishment of pensions in such cases impossible. It was just for these very people that friendly societies were so useful. Friendly societies and insurance societies were capable of filling up the gap which was necessarily left by the fact of many men being irregularly employed. Many of the friendly societies were doing that work at the present time, though not so many as he would like to see, because many of them had unfortunately been induced to stay their hands in the belief that a Government scheme was coming. In the Orwell Lodge of Independent Oddfellows, 3d. per week paid by a man under twenty years of age gave him a pension of 5s. per week at sixty-five. There were very few men in this country who could not afford to pay 3d. per week. There was the Dunmow Society, which, in a purely agricultural district, had the names of 150 pensioners on its books. Were these men, who had themselves made provision for their own old age, to be taxed for the benefit of those who had not made that provision? He admitted that if they were going to treat the matter as a charity it was fair to tax the community in order to give relief to the destitute, but they could not say that the man who had squandered his substance had a right to the substance of the man who had not squandered it. There was no right. It was only a question of charity. Thus they came back to the Poor Law, which might be described as a form of collective charity to provide for cases of destitution; the Poor Law did not ask questions about a man's past, very properly; it said to a man, "You are starving; we do not ask anything about your previous career; we will take you as you are, because the community will not allow you to starve; we will keep you in reasonable comfort, and with reasonable regard to the money of the people who are supporting you, and, if you behave yourself, as you grow older we will try to make your life easier." He believed that system was more humane than any of the systems of State pensioms. In conclusion he would point out that this claim for old age pensions had to a large extent arisen within the last fifty years, and that it was now too late, for the work had been largely done. It was just because of the progress the country had made that these pensions were now demanded. That might seem a paradox, but he ventured to quote, in support of the statement, from the admirable speech made by the hon Member for the Ince Division in the discussion upon the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill. The hon. Member pointed out that miners in the past twenty-five years had immensely improved their position, and that it was just that improvement in their position which had stimulated their demand for higher things. He entirely agreed with that and he believed it was the scientific basis of all social progress. They all knew that in the last fifty years wages had increased. He knew, perfectly well too, that in many cases wages were still insufficient. But there was in this proposal nothing that would increase wages; on the contrary, the proposal implied that wages were to remain insufficient. Instead of saying "We will not allow this insufficiency of wages to go on," it was said "We will allow the insufficiency to continue, but we will supplement it with charity at the end of a man's life." Another example of the social progress at the present time was the increased expenditure upon amusements, and when he heard of a young man living in lodgings spending 5s. or 6s. a week upon personal enjoyment, he asked himself "Was it right that such a man should put forward a claim at the end of his life to be supported by other people who had saved their money?" His temperance friends estimated that the average expenditure per family upon alcohol was 6s. a week; surely they had there an ample fund to provide old age pensions? It seemed to him that demands like this would always be met with as the condition of the country improved. It was with nations as with individuals. When a man was very ill he was too weak to make many demands, but as he grew convalescent he felt more acutely the remaining evils from which he suffered, and his demands for relief increased. Let them take care in trying to gratify these demands to act upon the experience of the past. The lines upon which they had hitherto proceeded had secured progress; let those lines be followed to further progress, and let not short cuts be attempted at the risk of our being led back to the

Slough of Despond from which we had escaped. He begged to move.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said he rose with great pleasure to second the Amendment, which had been moved in such an admirable speech. He quite agreed that the subject of old age pensions had been before the country on various occasions, and that it was proposed that these pensions were to be given irrespective of the previous life of the recipient, who was not to be called upon to contribute. That was the popular notion of old age pensions which had been advocated from a good many platforms. As far as he was himself concerned, in 1900 he stated publicly that he was opposed to the system of old age pensions, and when he was returned in 1906, the question was never raised. The mover of the Bill had calculated that a family of five, of which the income was 20s. a week, each paid £1 10s. a year taxation—or a total of £7 10s. for the family—as much in proportion as the millionaire paid. He did not know whether the figures with regard to the millionaire were right, because he had no means of checking them, but the figures with regard to the man with 20s. a week were absolutely wrong. He had a statement made by the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1902, when direct taxation was higher than it was now, and therefore the figures which he was quoting were rather against him. Indirect taxation in 1902 was £1 11s. 2d. per head. Of that £1 3s. 11d. was for taxes on spirits, beer and tobacco, and the other 7s. 3d. was for other articles of consumption. Taking a family of five, and adopting the figure of £1 10s. per head, he calculated that the amount paid by the family—allowing 7s. 3d. for the wife and three children—was not £7 10s., but about £3 per annum in taxation. It only showed how easy it was to make popular statements which were absolutely unfounded. All the schemes of pension on the great railways were very much more important to the men than 5s. a week; and his hon. friend opposite had made a good point when he said that it was the shareholders who were behind these pension schemes in nearly all the railway companies. Were all these shareholders to be taxed for other pensions besides contributing to the pensions of the railway employees? Five Committees had considered this question. Two consisted of Members of Parliament, and three of experts. The three Committees consisting of experts reported against an Old Age Pensions Bill; the two which consisted of Members of Parliament, the majority of whom were already pledged to a scheme of old age pensions, more or less reported in favour of the Bill. He himself preferred to take the opinion of the Committees composed of experts. The cost of old age pensions would be very great. It had been put at £26,000,000, but it was very difficult to say accurately whether that was going to be the cost of a pension of 5s. a week at the age of sixty-five. Capitalised, £26,000,000 represented £850,000,000, a larger sum than the National Debt, and he could not conceive that the majority of electors in the country could have understood that the scheme involved a larger sum than the National Debt, or that it was contemplated by the House of Commons or any responsible Government. When they talked of 5s. a week at the age of sixty-five, was the limit of age going to remain at sixty-five? Granted that this Bill were carried, and that in the first year the age was seventy-five, in the second seventy, and in the third sixty-five, at which it was to remain, what, in the fourth year would be the result? Those who received the pension were not disfranchised, and, if a general election were to come, they would be in the majority. It was quite certain that a very large number of people at the age of sixty, and who would like to have 5s. a week would make a demand upon the candidate that if he were elected he should support the reduction of the age limit to sixty. He had gone through five elections, four contested, and he had a little knowledge of the elector, and he said without fear of contradiction that it was very likely to occur that the candidate would not have the courage to get up and say "I won't vote for it." The same thing would occur in regard to the amount of the pension. In a discussion on the previous day hon. Members below the gangway had said that 25s. a week was not enough to live on in London. If that were so, how could anyone live on 5s.? The natural consequence would be that they would ask not only for a reduction in the age limit but an increase of the pension. He was afraid that the only result of a Bill of this sort would be to open the door to the greatest corruption that had ever been seen in this country, and that it would be very difficult to resist, because it would appeal to a very large number of people who would desire to obtain a better means of living out of the pockets and the industry of the hardworking and thrifty. It was for that reason he was opposed to the Bill or any Bill of a similar character. Any such Bill, to make it workable, just and honest, must be accompanied by a like contribution from the person who was going to receive the pension. His hon. friend who had moved the Amendment had said that the result of this proposal would be to discourage the organisations by which pensions were now given. He thought that was very likely to be one of the results of the Bill. It was almost certain that when a man thought he would recieve a pension of 5s a week, without in any way contributing to it himself, he would be inclined to say, especially in youth, "Oh, I will not put by that threepence a week which in forty or forty-five years would give me a pension of 5s. a week, but, on the contrary, I will spend it either on amusement, or on something that appeals to me at the present moment." The President of the Local Government Board stated recently that the Amalgamated Society of Engineers were paying 9s. a week to over 5,000 members who had subscribed to the institution. Was not that one of the ways in which pensions should be provided? Was not that a very great example of the good which this particular society had done, not only to its own members, but also to others in inculcating habits of thrift and saving? It seemed to him that their efforts should be devoted to encouraging thrift on the part of such institutions, instead of discouraging it by instituting a fund which would be available to everybody, including the drunkard and the jail-bird who had never done any good either to himself or to the State. The hon. Member for Wirral mentioned, by way of illustration, the case of a certain Mrs. Jones who had brought up a large family on 16s. a week. Of course, they were all perfectly well aware that there were a large number of people in the country who earned low wages, but it should be remembered that this Bill proposed to deal not only with that particular class, but with every class in the country. If the hon. Member had said that the Bill was to provide in old age for people in the unfortunate position of Mrs. Jones who were earning 16s. a week, he could have understood the force of the argument, although not altogether agreeing with it; but the Bill was not limited to that class. The Bill would apply also to skilled artisans who were earning £2 or £3 a week, and who were in a position to put by a sufficient sum to contribute to their support in old age. He did not deny that 16s. a week did not leave any great margin for saving. At the same time he happened to know that there were working men who, though earning less than that, had saved considerable sums. He instanced the case of a farm labourer who had never earned more than 14s. or 15s. a week in his life, and who now owned five freehold properties which had been purchased out of his own earnings. That man had brought up a family, and, though now seventy-five years of age, he was still working, at his own desire, on the particular farm on which he had worked for fifty years. He was popularly supposed to be worth £1,000. He himself was rather inclined to doubt that. But, it was not impossible for people who were earning only small wages to save something for their old age. As had been said by the hon. Member for Preston, it had always been considered discreditable for children not to look after their parents in their old age. That was a feeling that ought to be encouraged. Even a pension of 5s. a week would be certain to discourage that feeling. He wished to point out that a great number of people who came to the age of sixty-five were really incapable of looking after themselves on account of the illnesses and infirmities incidental to life. What was the use of 5s. a week to persons of that description? The *Daily Chronicle* of 28th February, 1904, contained the report of a case in which a widow, seventy-three years of age, was found lying dead on the floor by a neighbour who went into her house to give her a cup of tea. It was stated at the inquest that she received 4s. a week from the guardians. The jury found a verdict of death from natural causes, and the coroner remarked—

> "This is something for the guardians to think over. What is the good of giving 4s. a week to persons in this position?"

A great number of the people who received 5s. a week under an old age pension scheme would be in that position, and the same result would follow. He called attention to the significant fact, vouched by a member of the New Zealand Legislature, that the Pensions Act had been co-incident with a great increase of drunkenness in the Colony. Many of those who received the 5s. would have something of their own besides, and the temptation to spend the 5s. in drink would, in many cases, be irresistible. Similarly the experience of other Colonies where pensions schemes were in force seemed to show that there was a sufficient sum available out of earnings to be spent in gambling and betting and other regrettable ways. It was argued that old age pensions would lead to a material reduction in Poor Law expenditure. Possibly the £3,000,000 spent on outdoor relief might be saved, but he doubted very much whether there would be any saving at all in respect of the £10,000,000 spent in infirmaries and asylums, workhouses, and Poor Law schools. There had been a great increase in the amount of money held by friendly societies and savings banks. The return issued by the Chief Registrar for 1904 showed that the aggregate amount in these institutions was £402,000,000, as against £380,000,000 in 1902, and £306,000,000 in 1897, so it was evident that, instead of the means of saving having decreased, it had increased during the last few years. The House would make a very great error if, when this improvement was going on, it passed a law which would check thrift on the part of the people. It was absolutely necessary that thrift should be inculcated. As an example of the enormous advantage of thrift to a nation, he pointed to what happened in France at the close of the Franco-German war in 1871, when the people with their savings met the enormous indemnity claimed by Germany. He thought it showed that what was needed in this country was an increase in thrift, and legislation of the kind proposed in this Bill would tend to discourage it. The House should also think of the injustice which the thrifty man would suffer when his savings were taxed for the benefit of those who had been frivolous, idle, and dissolute. It was a popular thing to promise from a platform 5s. a week to everybody who chose to ask for it, but working men ought to consider that in the end it must come out of their own pockets. Such proposals tended to drive capitalists out of the country, and to take their money with them.

*MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.) said they could not do it. How, for example, could they take the railways out of the country?

SIR F. BANBURY said they could not take the railways out of the country, but they could take away some of the capital which was invested in railways. That capital amounted to £1,200,000,000 and it was not all owned by millionaires. The hon. Member would find, if he looked into the matter, that the average amount of stock held in railway companies by the owners was between £500 and £1,000.

*MR. CHIOZZA MONEY said that the hon. Baronet forgot that many persons held stock in more than one railway, and that as a matter of fact the railways of this country were owned by only 180,000 people.

SIR F. BANBURY said that did not alter his argument in the least. If capitalists took their money out of the country and invested it, say, in America, the income could be held in America if millionaires felt that they were being unjustly taxed here. They could go and live in America, and come back here for three or four months in the year and reside at big hotels. There was a very great misconception, not only as to the number of millionaires, but as to the way in which this money was employed. He had very great pleasure in seconding the Amendment of the hon. Member for Preston whom he admired for his courage in adhering to the old traditions of the Liberal Party, and in endeavouring to show that in personal exertion, industry, and saving lay the sound method of providing for old age.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'that' and to insert the words 'this House declines to proceed further with a measure which would enormously add to the national expenditure until the country has had an opportunity of saying whether it is willing to bear the necessary burden of taxation.'"—(*Mr. Harold Cox*).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. T. R. BETHELL (Essex, Maldon) said he did not think the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London would be the means of changing his views in regard to the necessity of a scheme of old age pensions. He was somewhat surprised to hear doubt thrown upon the mandate of the country on this question. He thought if there was one question more than another before the electors at the last general election it was that of old age pensions. During the last twelve years the subject had been dealt with at almost every political meeting in the country, and had also occupied a prominent position in the programme of the Opposition, although the Opposition when in power had not made any attempt to fulfil the promises they had given on this matter. The question had also been discussed by friendly and other societies throughout the country, and the people had had an opportunity of discovering what the cost of an old age pension scheme would be. That cost would depend on whether the system was to be universal or not, and the age at which the pension would be given. He found himself in a difficulty in regard to this measure. He was distinctly in favour of old age pensions; but he did not think a universal pension scheme in this country was practicable on account of its cost. In the first place, it could not be put into operation for a generation; and in the second place, he thought that to give old age pensions to the well-to-do would be almost to reduce the system to an absurdity. He was in favour of beginning with a limited scheme, starting at the age of seventy-five. That might appear, no doubt, as a high limit, and probably seventy would be the better mean to establish. The Hamilton Committee reported in regard to the cost of a scheme of pensions at different ages; that a pension granted at the age of seventy would cost, for the first year, something like £5,950,000, working up in twenty years to £9,550,000. That was a large sum; but it came within the range of possibility, especially in regard to the fact that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made provision for a fund which would go towards that amount. He was exceedingly grateful to the Chancellor of the Exchequer for having promised to make a beginning with a scheme of old age pensions next year. In Germany the age limit was seventy, and the scheme in operation there worked remarkably well; so much so that it was practically impossible to find in Germany to-day any person over seventy years of age in actual want. In New Zealand, New South Wales, and Victoria their systems of old age pensions had been working well for some years, and from recent reports he found that there was a recommendation to extend the scheme to the whole of the Australian Commonwealth. He thought that the experience which had been gained in those countries went to dispose of the idea of any evil consequences which would arise from a general old age pension scheme. In the constituency which he represented they had an old age relief fund, supported entirely by voluntary subscriptions. It had been in operation for several years, and had done a great deal of good to the recipients. The only objection he had to find with it was that it had rather the appearance of charity. And he considered that a pension should be regarded more as a right than as a dole. About £500 a year was given away to a large number of persons over seventy years of age, and they had come to regard that relief as a means of their avoiding what they considered the shame of taking parish relief. He himself sympathised with that feeling of old people against going on the parish. He believed that a national system of old age pensions would do a great deal to end the difficulties in the rural districts in the country. If a farm labourer could feel assured that, after a life of continuous toil, some provision was made for him in his declining years, he would regard life on a farm more contentedly, and would have less desire to move into the town. His conviction was that a national system of old age pensions, so far from pauperising the people, would do much to save them from pauperism, to lessen rural depopulation, and to check the wasteful and harmful effect of our present Poor Law administration.

*MR. J. W. TAYLOR (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said he regretted that the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London was not present, because he desired to compliment him on the ingenious manner in which he had brought before the House the pamphlet of the British Councils' Association on old age pensions. He ventured to say that very few private Members' Bills presented to the House had excited greater interest in the country than the measure under discussion, and that, he believed, was because this Bill was more in harmony with the spirit and sentiment of the present House of Commons than any other measure which had yet been brought before it. They all wanted, and this was the final object of the Bill, to bring a brightening and a sweetening influence into the declining years of our hard-working old people. That was proved by one or two facts. First of all, the struggle for existence was becoming harder for the working classes than in the past; and secondly, old age now began at a much earlier period than used to be the case. The fact was that public life was now quickened, and most people desired that the conditions under which our old people lived in their declining years should be improved. In spite of what had been said, there was no subject at the general election which had stimulated more genuine enthusiasm than that of old age pensions, and it was quite time that the Government came forward with their help. Since 1895, when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham promulgated his scheme for old age pensions, the subject had been discussed on every political platform in the country, and any wise and prudent Government must recognise the unmistakable and growing desire that the declining years of our old people should be made as comfortable and pleasant as possible. It was true that many men who had worked willingly until their strength and vigour had failed, in their declining years had a grudge against the State, because no provision was made for their old age. They felt that they had done their best, and yet had come to destitution and want. He knew it was stated that there were other ways by which the difficulty could be solved than by old age pensions—by the gradual increase in wages, and by the cultivation of the spirit of thrift. But they knew from the frequent negotiations which took place between trade unions and employers how difficult it was to obtain for the workers a high rate of wages. The conflict between capital and labour was so keen that it took all the workers' energies, time, and persuasive power to exact what they thought was a living wage, and in many cases they were never able to save anything for old age. He knew how dangerous it was to admit anything, but he believed that truth itself was unalterable. He conceded that some working men had been able to save a little. He also admitted that very much of the hard-earned money of the working people went into a bag with holes in it; it frequently went the wrong way; but still there were many thousands of decent, honest, industrious working men with families, who after they had done there best could scarcely make ends meet, and who could not make provision for their declining years. That was no fancy picture used to play upon the credulity of the House. If there was one thing he had learned during his short experience in Parliament, it was that the House was not going to be bamboozled by anything like sentiment. What the House wanted was the truth of things, and it would then seek to discover a remedy for the evils of which they complained. In the county of Durham they had endeavoured, with much success, due largely to the initiative and zeal of the hon. Member for Mid. Durham, to provide 200 homes for their aged people; and their friends in Northumberland were following their example, and he hoped that their efforts would be crowned with as much success as their enterprise in Durham. Those who had been in close contact with this particular movement had witnessed the sunshine which had gleamed into the lives of their old people in those counties; and they thought how much happier it would be if a similar scheme could be devised for the whole of England, and that was why they heartily supported the present Bill. There were a few provisions in the Bill with which they might be disposed to quarrel; but it was a Bill which went in the right direction, and they should have some definite pronouncement from the Government that they intended to see that the lives of the aged poor were made brighter, better, and happier.

*Mr. DUCKWORTH (Stockport) said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech had made a conditional promise to deal with the subject of old age pensions next year. Some people might think that they should accept that promise, and wait till next year; but in spite of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman, the matter of old age pensions was so urgent that they should lose no opportunity of pressing it on the attention of the Government and of the House. They were entitled to do this by two considerations. The first was, that many of them gave pledges in regard to the matter to their constituents at the general election. The Chancellor of the Exchequer might be able to say that he gave no pledge; but some of them, fortunately or unfortunately, could not hide themselves in that refuge. They did pledge themselves to do all they could, and as soon as possible, to establish a scheme of old age pensions. Another reason was the sad condition of thousands of our aged poor. He quite appreciated the sympathetic words which the Chancellor of the Exchequer uttered in his Budget speech on this subject, and if he criticised the Budget it was in no unfriendly spirit, because he thought it was a statesmanlike one, which if looked at from the right hon. Gentleman's point of view, and taking in as he did the next two or three years, was nearly a perfect one. But there was this very large "if." If they were allowed to have their own way this policy might be carried out; he hoped the Government would have their own way, and would continue in office till the end of their ordinary term, and that then they would be sent back for another seven years of power, a course which in his opinion was necessary to undo some of the mischiefs resulting from the extravagances of the last Administration. He hoped the Government would remain in office as long as they had work to do, but do not let them have a repetition of 1874 and 1892. Many of them had promised old age pensions at the last general election; but the cup might be dashed from the lips of the aged poor, by war, by bad trade, by trouble in India, or by disunion among themselves which might cause their majority to dwindle. Hon. Members must be aware that Primrose League dames were proclaiming from every platform that there would be a general election next year. In this connection he remembered a story told by the proprietor of a steamer on an American river. It was his ambition to have the loudest hooter on the river, and when the one he ordered had been constructed the blast from it was terrific. But he noticed that when the hooter started the steamer stopped, and he went to the engineer and inquired the reason. The engineer replied that the hooter had taken all the steam. He hoped that would not be the case with the promises made by the Government. What he meant to convey was that one bird in the hand was worth two in the bush, and they should not put off till to-morrow what they could do to-day. Instead of reducing the National Debt by so large an amount this year, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have done well to give half the sum he had devoted to that purpose to the reduction of the sugar tax and to making a beginning, if only on a small scale, with old age pensions. No doubt it was a proper thing to pay off Debt, and they must be just before they were generous. As a Party they said this was not Debt for which they were responsible, and the sooner it was paid off the sooner hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite would be able to run another scare and render the country subject to further liabilities. His opinion was that the Debt should be reduced by a smaller sum and reduced more gradually, and that would enable them to carry out the reforms which they had promised for the betterment of the poor and the oppressed. He wished to plead the urgency of this matter of old age pensions, although he would not trouble the House with figures which had already been given by previous speakers, who had shown how many of our old people felt that they would have to go to the workhouse in their declining years. The working population felt their position most keenly in that respect and had the strongest objection to applying for parish relief; many of them, indeed, would die in the streets before they would go to the workhouse. The idea to them of becoming a pauper was more dreadful than death itself. They remembered the lines—

"Rattle his bones, over the stones;
He's only a pauper whom nobody owns."

These old people very often became dependent upon their relatives. Parents went to live with a married daughter or son or other relative and added considerably to the burdens of the breadwinner of the family. Let the House imagine what it meant to a man with from 18s. or 20s. a week, with three or four children, to have his aged father or mother put upon him. Let them also imagine what a difference it would make if that aged parent had 5s. a week coming in. It would make all the difference in comfort, and the old people would feel independent. He knew what he was talking about, and there were few things which appealed to him more than the subject of old age pensions.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said he was in favour of the principle of old age pensions; but he could not see the use of giving a pension to a person who was getting £1 a week or more. The Member for Preston had said that 5s. a week was not enough for an old age pension, but in the country villages with which he was acquainted any old people could find a very comfortable home for that sum; indeed the villagers—and a very good sort of people they were—would be very glad to have them. The same hon. Member had raised the objection that protection was absolutely necessary if we were to have old age pensions. He hoped the Members specially interested in labour would take notice of that, because it was a great admission from such a source. He thought there was very great difficulty about this question, but the more he had been about the country the more he was convinced that there should be some system of the kind. He did not think, however, that the Bill went the best way about it. He thought the best way of beginning—and there must be a beginning in all these things—was to assist friendly societies to give benefits to their aged members. It was said that friendly societies were very much against this movement, but he believed that was not the case. On the whole he was bound to agree that he could not see where the money was to come from for old age pensions unless we protected our own industries and our own working people against unfair foreign competition.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside), referring to the keen and searching criticism to which the hon. Member for Preston had subjected the Bill, said it was useful to have some one in the House who would play the part of devil's advocate against popular schemes of this kind, and he knew no one with a greater gift for the part than the hon. Member. The point of the hon. Member seemed to be that the system of old-age pensions was inseparable from Socialism but that did not seem to him to be the case at all. He thought his hon. friend the Member for Preston, with all his ingenuity, had failed to grapple with the central economic difficulty which was the constant inspiration of schemes for old age pensions. His hon. friend had declared it was a duty incumbent on all to make provision through life for their old age. That was to say it was the duty of all to save money for investment. It was absolutely impossible for the majority of those engaged in commercial life to save. The thing could not be done. It was unnecessary to prove that multitudes of poor people had difficulty in saving. To the thousands of people who could not save must be added the thousands who did save, and whose earnings were lost in bad investments. For every thousand pounds saved, a certain proportion was lost in unsound investments. The economic situation stood thus: profitable investment was limited by consumption, the profitable basis for investment was production, and if there was to be a continuous limitation of consumption, because of this thrift and saving, there could not be an increase in production. Among many of the German economists it had been clearly recognised that there was a limit to the amount of saving that could be done at a profit. He did not propose to trouble the House with any figures, but would say that the act of increasing the savings of the country this year by £100,000,000 would make the investment unsafe, instead of safe, because the consumption would be cut down. That was the crux of the question, and the reason the hon. Member for Preston did not disclose it was that he had on previous occasions given his adhesion to that argument. The fact of the matter was that his hon. friend had grown so much afraid of socialistic tyranny that he had even left economic truth out of account and had put before the House an argument which economically was not sound. He was bound to admit that our scheme of old age pensions would have to be a limited scheme. In the enthusiasm of his youthful conversion to old age pensions he adopted the doctrine of Mr. Charles Booth that the pension should be payable to all, but when he found that the main difficulty of the House was to find money to do anything, he thought it would be absurd to go about and find money to give pensions to people who did not need them; therefore, the scheme must be limited. Pensions should only be paid to those who were poor. The hon. Member for Preston would then say if pensions were paid only to the poor it would discourage thrift, but as he had remarked before, if the economic impossibility of continuous profitable saving was true, it could not discourage thrift. A wise man had once said it was always safe to tell the whole truth; whether it was safe or not he did not know, but he ventured to tell it on this occasion. The House would have to recognise in regard to this matter that it was not its business to encourage thrift at all in the sense of economic savings for investment. One year he noticed by the admission of the Stock Exchange authorities that at least £100,000 had been lost in unprofitable investments. If it was true that there was this obvious limit to profitable savings, it could not be the business of the House to encourage thrift. The hon. Member for Preston had laid the main stress of his arguments against the Bill on the pictures he drew of the dangers we should have to face of seeing the thriftless wastrels, who contrived to live to the age of sixty-five without work, coming upon the country to be supported by the State. He did not doubt that when a system of old age pensions was started such anomalies would have to be faced. They were endeavouring to raise the people from a vast morass of misery and poverty, and the process could never be carried out without a great many of the existing evils accompanying it for a long time. Of course there would be fraud, the world was full of fraud, but the question was, which way the balance of good would lie. While the State might have to carry along on its shoulders the thriftless persons and the wastrels, in the nature of things these persons would not be in the majority, and on the other hand, they would correct the present appalling evil to which attention had been drawn by the hon. Member for Wirral, that people might live industriously, thriftily, and with self denial, through a long life, even putting money into some sound investment, only to find at the end of their lives that that investment had been lost through some new process of competitive production having made the investment unsound. Unsound investments would always be provided, so long as the amount of saving that was done was beyond the amount of economical possibility having regard to consumption. The ordinary process of the expansion of commerce resulted in masses of capital being constantly destroyed by the bringing to bear of new methods on competitive production. What they desired now was to put social restraint on people not capable of looking after themselves. On the other hand, it was said that it would be impossible to raise the money without resorting to protection. The mover of the Second Reading had shown that the money could be provided by an extension of the system of a graduated income tax. To that system he might add another—the taxation of land values. Yet another way of getting the money was to limit the present appalling and wasteful expenditure upon armaments. One would have expected the hon. Member for Preston to be disturbed and perturbed to the last degree at the amount which was expended every year in armaments, but upon that side he appeared to suffer no discomfort whatever. It was quite conceivable to everybody who had contemplated the socialistic problem that this House might one day contemplate the municipal provision of bread and clothing, but if that day came it would be because it paid to do it, because it made for civilisation. But that development would not happen in the time of any man now living, and the possibility of that ultimate development of society should surely not be allowed to influence a single member against a scheme which could be demonstrated to be sound in the present state of the community.

MR. BEALE (Ayrshire, S.) said that both the mover and the seconder of this Bill were exceedingly apprehensive of the criticisms of the hon. Member for Preston, but he did not think that anything that was said in support of the Amendment altered the view in which they regarded the proposition put forward by the hon. Member for Wirral. The two reasons the hon. Member for Preston put before the House for not voting for the Second Reading were the fear that it would result in an enormous increase of taxation and the opportunity the Bill would give for fraud. He really thought the hon. Member knew exactly what the answer was to the increase of taxation. The hon. Member for Preston touched very lightly upon the argument that what was proposed to be done was not to put a new burden upon the people, but a readjustment of the existing burden. So long as we did not kill people sixty-five years of age, somebody kept them alive. The hon. Member had said that if they were going to apply that readjustment to the relief of old age, they might as well apply it to the provision of bread, which was just as necessary. They did not advocate an old age pension scheme merely because it was a readjustment of burden. They advocated it because it was a thing which was good in itself, and only dwelt upon the argument that it was a readjustment of the burden of taxation as an answer to the objection that they were now imposing a new burden on the community. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down that if they were so civilised that they could make out a national case for the supply of bread, or anything else, he could conceive a time when this country would not mind doing it. That was used as an answer to the attempt to hold an appalling picture before the House of the burden this Bill was putting on the people. The hon. Member for Preston had asked how were they to pay £26,000,000. The answer was that that £26,000,000 was now being paid by somebody, that they wanted to readjust that burden, and that if it was rightly adjusted it would come back again to the State in other ways. Up to the present time this burden had been more or less unequally distributed among the people. The greater part had been borne by people whose incomes were over £160 a year. In fact, at the present moment, there was a burden equivalent to £30 a head upon 840,000 of the population. These people were in fact now paying this sum of money, and what he wanted to see was that those who were doing their share now should continue to do it, and that those who were not should have this taxation so readjusted as to have the proper burden put upon their shoulders. Until they faced the problem of how much everybody ought to pay, what was every person's share as a citizen, they could not get out of it by the general broad assertion that we could afford a war, and therefore could afford to pay old-age pensions. The argument of increased taxation was disposed of by shewing that the readjustment of the burden must be equitably considered, and he was quite sure that when considered in that light people with even the smallest income would cheerfully bear their share. He would not like to put any difficulty in the way of anyone getting a pension, provided that taxation was so readjusted that the persons who received it had paid their own share towards it. He would much prefer that the Bill should so work that each man bore, and in case of need, received his share. They were told that certain people were not to have this pension, because they had been in prison, or had become bankrupt, or for some other reason. That in his opinion was a mistake. There was no economy in it, it simply gave a good deal of trouble, and only militated against giving that man 5s. a week to keep him out of the workhouse. It was bad economy, and there was no reason for it. The only thing that was necessary as a test was whether the man could live on the pension, and that could be secured, because as soon as a man came for relief his pension would fall into the hands of the Poor Law Authorities until he could show them that he could live upon it. An idea ran through the House that they were pampering these people, and giving them something which they ought tó do for themselves to keep them out of the workhouse. It might be so, but if they had this clear power to discriminate between those who could live upon their pension and those who came to the workhouse, the conditions of the workhouse could be made far less agreeable. The argument that the pension would be spent in drink or misused in some way would be entirely gone if the guardians were given a first charge on the pension, because the guardians could take away the pension immediately a man applied for poor relief. He thought the financial part of the Bill had not been worked out, and no good would come until the financial problem was tackled in a very different way from merely throwing the matter over to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to see what he could do.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said he was one of those who promised his constituents to use his personal influence, as far as he could, to forward a scheme of old age pensions. He considered election pledges the most important a man could give. He went to the people of his constituency who did not profess to have any knowledge of affairs; he did profess to have knowledge of affairs, and upon making certain promises was elected to this House. In his view there were two classes of old age pension schemes, one of which was impracticable and the other practicable. The class of scheme which proposed in three years to cost £26,000,000 annually was impracticable, so far as this House was concerned. He himself would reduce the cost of the Army by £10,000,000 a year and the Navy by £10,000,000, but such drastic economy could not yet be carried in the House nor in the country, and also neither this House nor the country would approve an additional 1s. on the income-tax, and extra duties on tea and sugar for such a scheme, and therefore for the present such a scheme belonged to the impracticable class. The author of the Bill had made a valuable and instructive speech, and the speeches of the hon. Members for Preston, Tyneside, and South Ayreshire were most learned and valuable contributions to a somewhat academic discussion, but he wished to make a beginning now, and after that beginning was made he would then gladly listen for the next ten or twenty years to a discussion on schemes requiring from the Exchequer £10,000,000, £20,000,000, £30,000,000 or £50,000,000, he cared not which, but let them begin it in a practical way. He had no wish to say anything about little by little, or step by step, but the only practical way was one step at a time. Some of those who had sent him to Parliament were the poorest in the United Kingdom, and if he went back to his constituents with nothing done on their behalf, they would say, "What is the use of him, he is no better than the old representative." He was prepared to vote for any practical scheme of old age pensions. He would point out that it was practicable to give old age pensions without a penny of extra expense to any mortal in the world. What was the difference between old age pensions and outdoor relief? The difference was that old age pensions did not pauperise, and outdoor relief did, owing to the disabilities which attached to it whereby the recipient lost his position as a citizen. Let them take away those disabilities from men and women of sixty-five years and upwards and it became an old age pension. Then the old people would have votes and be of political importance. He knew a lot of these old people, and they valued their dignity as much as anyone else. What did they want? They were getting now perhaps 3s. 6d. per week as outdoor relief, which was not enough. These men and women would be rich, especially if two of them lived together, if they received 5s. a week each. And what would it cost? The cost in his division of increasing the out-door relief by 2s. a week from 3s. to 5s. for those persons of sixty-five years of age and upwards would come to a sum not exceeding another 2d. in the £ on the rates. If he proposed that it should all be put upon the rate, it would be probably thrown out by the ratepayers, but if the Chancellor of the Exchequer came forward and paid a 1d. of it out of the Consolidated Fund, that was a thing that would make it go down with a great many of the ratepayers, who would gladly pay the other penny. They had only to carry a scheme of that sort and the thing was done. It was something that the old people in his division desired very much. It was something that would bring comfort and joy to many houses all over the county divisions of England. The question was how it was to be done, and whether they had legal sanction for this improvement in outdoor relief. He contended they had that sanction. If they looked at the law and history of this country they found that men owning land held it on the distinct understanding that they kept the poor of the parish, otherwise all the rents went to the State. For this reason he objected to putting the burden on industry, that was to say, on the general taxpayers; but he was willing to make a compromise, and it was for that reason that he suggested that a penny should be given out of the Consolidated Fund. That would cost the Exchequer about £1,000,000 a year; the Chancellor could afford that much now. Year by year the grant might be increased, and hon. Members would not be stultified in their promise for a scheme of old age pensions, though eventually it cost £30,000,000 or more. He had said to the people in his division that everything about him was beautiful, delightful, and glorious, but there were some among them who were starving. Was it necessary that that should be so? No, it was not, because there was sufficient wealth in the land, if equally divided, to give £200 a year to each family, but many labourers with families did not get £40 a year. All that was necessary was to apply some of our great and superfluous wealth in the way he had suggested. Although the pension would be payable through the Poor Law authorities, he thought no degradation would be felt in receiving assistance through that agency, when the disability in the matter of the franchise had once been removed. Such a great social reform would make this Parliament renowned in the history of the world.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said that as one who took an active part in the last Parliament when they introduced and nearly passed a similar Bill, he would like to call attention to the fact that the experience then gained provided both encouragement and warning. It was possibly true that in regard to this matter, if they confined themselves to academic discussion, they might listen to such speeches as that of the hon. Member for Preston for five, ten, or twenty-five years. What they had to secure from the Government was that something should be done. The last Parliament voted for the principle of this Bill. The Second Reading was carried, but the Bill never got any further. Those who were really in earnest on this matter ought to try and bring pressure to bear on the Government to give some more definite pledge than had been given, that they actually intended to bring in a Bill and deal with this subject in the early future. A Bill had never been more ably or sympathetically presented, and they could not hope for more than would be given by this Bill. The hon. Member for Preston had said it was the duty of a man to contribute to his own pension. If he were a labourer at 10s. or 11s. a week like many in county Down, he would not find it easy to contribute largely to his own pension, and if he did it would be selfish rather than otherwise to do so. He heartily seconded the Second Reading.

MR. CROOKS said that this was a question very near his heart. It had caused him more trouble than anything else in his life. He felt that on a day like this they had much to regret the absence of the right hon. Member for West Birmingham, whose speeches on this matter had been repeated so many times. He was sorry he was not present, and for the reason which caused his absence. It had always been urged against this Bill that there were people in this world who would not try, who never could and who did not want to get on—who were thriftless, who were wastrels, and useless. He knew it, but they were not confined to one class; there were many of them strolling about in Rotten Row in silk hats and spats, looking very comfortable and not over anxious for a job; the world was full of willing people, some willing to work, and the others willing to let them. Some people thought this was a new question in the House, but as far back as 134 years ago the House passed a measure for old age pensions, and sent it up to the House of Lords, where it was defeated. They were now trying to make up for lost time. It was not an unreasonable thing in a discussion of this kind to show the position of many persons in the State. Hon. Members perhaps did not know that 42·7 out of every hundred people who reached the age of sixty died paupers. They could not all have been drunkards. It was bad enough for a man to get old without being artful enough to get rich, without being blamed for the fact, and being told that he would not have got old if he had not drank. The speech of the hon. Member for the Tyneside Division on thrift was magnificent. He remembered having that question with regard to thrift put to him when he was examined before the Royal Commission. He was asked whether he did not think the poor might exercise a little thrift, and he said he thought they might exercise a good deal. It was very easy to be thrifty on £18 a week, but a bit of a job on 18s. Let a man be ever so thrifty it could only be while he was in work. They must remember that when they spoke of a working man's regular work, it was only regular so long as he was well. There was only one permanent situation, and that was in the cemetery, and it did not matter much about pensions there. How much self-control would a working man want if his wife was not well, and the children wanted boots, to allow his wife to go unattended or his children to run about barefooted while he saved that £5 towards his pension? The whole neighbourhood would be up in arms about it, and want to know what the blackguard meant by it. After all, the employer accumulated the wealth of the country, and it was the employer who should pay. He was told that one of the charges against him was that it was no part of the duties of a Member of Parliament to "adjust social inequalities." It was a delightful phrase; he could imagine the hon. Member for the City of London using it; it came so glibly from the tongue when one's stomach and one's pocket were full. One man was hungry. What of it? The other was full. If one gave the starving man anything, it was an endeavour to "adjust inequalities." The House of Commons was created for the express purpose, and for no other purpose, of adjusting social inequalities; that was its function from very earliest inception. They were its told that the Joneses, father and mother, were such excellent parents that it would be a crime if their children did not look after them in their old age. And they were told of the bad sons and the bad daughters who did not perform that duty. But were they ever told of the hundreds and hundreds of good sons and good daughters who faithfully helped their aged parents at sacrifices known only to themselves? There were sons with small wages who were heroic in what they did for their parents. The world did not hear of these quiet sacrifices; decent pride kept them hidden. A case had come under his own eye, that of a young married man with 27s. a week. He took his money home on the Saturday, and gave it to his wife, who sat despondent. He put the money into her lap. "What am I to do with this?" she asked. "It's all I've got," he said, and she answered that the children were in need of boots. "Well, get them." "Yes, but what about mother?" Well, she had better see mother; and he went out to get a shave, as was the practice of a man when he saw how it stood with the wife. The children wanted boots, so the wife went and saw the mother, with what result? Why, the old grandmother merely said, "Get an order for the house." She could not stand in the way of her grandbairns going without shoes to their feet. And that was the way the poor made sacrifices for each other. Yet a man in these circumstances was told to be thrifty! He had been associated with the Poor Law ever since he could remember, for he could recollect that, when five years of age, he went before the Board of Guardians, holding on to his mother's skirt, and he recalled how he was pointed to as a little chap that ought to be getting his own living. He had been Chairman of the Board of Guardians for nine years, and he knew the condition of the poor in Poplar. Poplar was now dragged into every discussion; it had even been made to do duty in the debate on the Irish Council Bill the other day. He had heard old men and women who had outlived their relations tell of their struggles, how they had paid into friendly societies, and how they had done their best to make both ends meet. There was the case of one old man who had applied for out-door relief; but in this enlightened and Christian country they were not allowed to give relief part of which might be spent on rent, so that they were obliged to order the decent old man into the workhouse. A bricklayer with a pension of 6s. a week applied for outdoor relief, and he was told that some people thought that it was an adequate pension. The man replied, "Do they really; I should like to see them pay 3s. 6d. a week rent, and the man and the old woman live on the other half crown." This man had been thrifty, had done his best, and had got stranded. Thrifty and unthrifty, when they got past the age of sixty-five, had to live very largely on precarious charity or out-door relief. These men who had lost the power of work were the men who, in their days of vigour, created the wealth of the country, and were they going to turn their back upon them? Something like £28,000,000 a year were set out as for Poor Law purposes, but a large proportion of that sum went in directions which had nothing to do with the Poor Law at all. Of the total sum £13,000,000 went to the relief of the poor; or, to be accurate, a considerable part of the £13,000,000 went on furniture, pensions, etc., until all that was left of the £28,000,000 was £6,000,000 for the actual relief of the poor. If the system of old age pensions were adopted it would stop the recruiting ground for old people to go into the workhouse; they would gradually get rid of these workhouses, and they would increase the membership of friendly societies and trade unions. He had always said that once they affirmed the principle of old age pensions it would be the duty of the Executive to find the ways and means. If they wanted to increase the Navy they would not begin to argue with the First Lord of the Admiralty; the fact was if he wanted the ships the ships he must have, and all England would roar about the glorious Navy. But there was other expenditure necessary for the good of the State, and he put old age pensions on that principle; they were to save life, to preserve life, and to give aged veterans a better chance. He appealed to the House to affirm the principle of this Bill, and leave it to the the Chancellor of the Exchequer to find the ways and means.

*MR. F. W. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said he had listened with admiration to the extremely interesting speech of the hon. Member for Preston. There was, however, one fallacy running through it. The hon. Gentleman said that the pension must depend on contribution. Certainly, but it seemed to him and to a good many others, he thought, that the hon. Member meant a money contribution which left entirely out of account the contribution of work or money's worth, which was of much greater value than a money contribution. If they took the money contribution in proportion to income, it was very much greater from the poor man than it was from the rich. If they took the contribution in money, as well as in work which had a money value a very strong case indeed was established for old age pensions for poor workers. He was one of those Members of the House who, at the general election, had carefully guarded himself from any definite promise beyond saying that it would be the clear duty of the House to discuss this question with an open mind, to see how far they could go in the direction of giving to those who had worked for the State and country some return in their old age, exactly on the same principle as that on which they gave pensions to our generals and admirals, diplomats, people in high station, and Cabinet Ministers, to whom pensions were given, not because they had paid rates and taxes, but because they had contributed in work to the welfare of their country. It would, of course, be said that this did not meet the case of the unthrifty, and those who did not contribute to the good of the country at large. The case of the idle and the vicious could never be met, and ought never to be met by old age pensions, and in the Bill before them, although he did not pin himself to every clause of it, and conceded that, on subsequent stages, it might be improved upon, yet he thought that they had got an indication that the drunkard, the unthrifty man, the worthless man, and the criminal were not to be set on a footing for old age pensions, and that was a distinction which it was quite right to preserve. The principle of old age pensions had been practically accepted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had also accepted the principle of graduated taxation, from which many of them hoped to get a great deal of the money which would provide for old age pensions. The other sources of income would no doubt result from a far less expenditure on what the country did not want. Again, another source of income would be the reduction of the expenditure on the Poor Law, which many of them had to lament to-day. Reference had been made to the German system, in which he thought there was a great deal that was admirable; but it must not be forgotten that the system was based on contributions from three different sources. The employers, the workmen, and the State contributed, and this system of triple contribution worked extremely well in Germany. But behind that system there was State compulsion. He very much doubted whether this country was ready to accept the system of State compulsion to the same extent as it was worked in Germany. In England they disliked compulsion in any form. Care must be taken not to arouse in reference to a system of old age pensions the same opposition to the principle of compulsion which had shown itself in regard to military service. As to what was frequently said about thriftless and drunken people amongst the working classes, the number was often put down as much larger than actually existed. The enormous majority of the working classes did work, and they would work not less but more if they knew that at the end of the long life of toil there would be something better than that bastile, the workhouse. A system of old age pensions towards which every working member of the community contributed directly or indirectly would rouse public opinion in favour of the worker and against the loafer, and be an invaluable incentive reducing largely the numbers of those who now came upon the public funds as the direct result of idleness, improvidence and vice.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I agree with previous speakers in thinking that the debate has been a most interesting one, and it has been taken part in by an unusually large number of hon. Members. In the absence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has to keep a public engagement, and speaking on behalf of the Government, I direct attention to the difference between the present debate and the many discussions which have taken place on the subject in previous years. This question is assuming a different shape now that it is being approached from the practical point of view. The economic doctrinaire is less insistent, and it is agreed that something must be done. Opinion is divided only as to the means and the time. The hon. Member for Preston has uttered a number of warnings that will certainly have to be remembered by any one responsible for a pension scheme. Schemes from other countries had been talked about, but I do not believe that the German pension scheme is adaptable to this country. I do not, however, think that it is necessary to go to Australia and Germany for experience, because, to a large extent, the conditions in those countries are quite different from the conditions here. No other country, for instance, has the enormous network of friendly society organisations that we have; and any scheme of old age pensions must take into account these 28,000 separate organisations, with 13,000,000 or 14,000,000 members, all of which make some sort of provision for the old the maimed, and the sick in the army o industry as well as for the various other ills which flesh is heir to. But the opposition to any scheme of old age pensions is growing smaller by degrees and beautifully less in this House, and with the exception of the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London and the hon. Member for Preston we really have no out-and-out opponents of old age pensions, although there are differences as to methods and as to how the money is to be obtained. The friendly societies a few years ago were opposed to any form of old age pensions, but they have now changed their views. It is safe to say now that neither friendly societies nor trade unions are opposed to some form of old age pensions. I am aware that some want contributory schemes, some have asked for subsidies to friendly societies, and a few want no scheme at all. It has been boldly said—and I think Labour members will recognise that there is some force in the suggestion—that a State pension scheme might be a State subsidy to low wages or to a low standard of comfort. It has also been suggested that the provision of an old age pension for a son's father or mother might, in some respects, diminish paternal or maternal regard, and sterilise some of those filial qualities which all of us wish to stimulate. It is generally agreed now that provision for the aged not now provided for is essential, and that it must come out of the rates or the taxes. But on the question as to who is to be regarded as eligible for pension there is a greater division now than a few years ago, and, as to the amount of the pension the advocates of a universal scheme are beginning to realise that differentiation must be made between urban and rural conditions as well as between person and person. All must realise that if an old couple were to get 5s. each and 1s. or 2s. each week from a son or a daughter, the collective income to those people in the country would be of infinitely more value and good than 15s. or 16s. a week from a State pension fund to a man living in London or in any other large city. I agree with the hon. Member for Woolwich that if anything is to be done, it must be worked out, not by a committee, but by the departments of the State. There is a sum of £16,500,000 now spent on the Poor Law which may, in part, be diverted to the provision of old age pensions, and these two systems —the Poor Law and the pension scheme —must be run side by side for the mutual benefit of both. As to who should be qualified for a pension, experience indicates that, in the first instance, it will not be possible to lay down the rule that every man of sixty-five years of age should have a pension irrespective of character. There are an enormous number of people in a condition, mentally, morally, and physically, in which a pension of 5s. a week would do more harm than good. The Government accept the principle embodied in the Bill, though they differ from and cannot under any circumstances accept some of its proposals. I should be sorry, for instance, to see it made a condition, whatever the amount was, that after a man had become a recipient, he should have to go to the town hall or the parish room to ask for his pension. An hon Member has suggested that if there happened to be a long *queue* of applicants waiting for their pensions a busy man would not waste his time by hanging on to the end of the *queue* but would go elsewhere, and the pension scheme would profit to that extent. I think that kind of thing would lead to confusion, irritation, and humiliation. There is another point in the Bill which ought to be taken into consideration, and that is Clause 12, which imposes a larger number of restrictions and disabilities than I expected to find in a universal Bill of this kind. Then there is Clause 17, which creates a form of claim, registration, and supervision of the distribution that the Government cannot, under any circumstances, accept, because of our knowledge of the difficulties of working this and similar schemes. Now I will pass from these details of the Bill to the question of the cost. Whether the House realises it or not, it is the fact that this Bill would cost from £26,000,000 to £29,000,000 in the next three years. That means on the present basis of taxation, increased imposts on certain persons or things. It means, perhaps, diminished revenue from other sources, and, as the demands on rates and taxes are rapidly increasing, my view is that the Government would find it financially impossible to promise that they would spend from £26,000,000 to £29,000,000. They cannot raise any of this money by increasing indirect taxation. The taxes on tea and sugar and other foods are high enough, and I am one of those who hope to see the day when they will be reduced. I do not think that, on the present basis, we can raise more money by minor readjustments, and if we have to raise £26,000,000 or £29,000,000 as hon. Members opposite want them to be raised, by taxes on food, the people, I think, would rather postpone the old age pension scheme.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Not taxes on food, but taxes upon foreign manufactured articles.

*Mr. JOHN BURNS: It has been suggested that this large sum could be raised by cumulative or graduated death duties. It might be said that we do not want to pay £26,000,000 or £29,000,000 at once, and that people would be content if there is a beginning, and a beginning soon. I do not hear that cheered.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: There is no cheer for that.

*Mr. JOHN BURNS: Does the hon. Member suggest that we should provide £26,000,000 or £29,000,000 at once.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: No; what I do suggest is that you would not want half of that sum.

*Mr. JOHN BURNS: I am sorry that I have not yet heard how everybody is going to get an old age pension at the cost of nobody. Judging from the experience and the speeches of the last year or two on this subject, there seems to be a desire that something should be done, and I may remind the House that on the 18th of April last, the Chancellor of the Exchequer not only hypothecated but allocated £2,250,000 as the nucleus of an old age pension scheme. I promised the House upon a former occasion that I would get together all the information I could on this subject, and I now have it in draft for circulation. I have collected certain *data* as to how we can begin, and I find that if we are to have a universal oldage pension of 5s. a week at sixty-five years of age it would in July, 1907, cost £29,000,000. If, however, we are to make the deductions laid down by the Hamilton Committee and exclude paupers, casuals, vagrants, lunatics, and criminals, such a scheme would cost £10,780,000 in 1907, £11,000,000 in 1911, and £12,000,000 in 1921. The scheme, with these deductions, will, if the ages are placed at seventy, cost £6,119,000 in 1907, £6,273,000 in 1911, and £6,727,000 in 1921. On the basis of seventy-five years, and with the Hamilton deductions, the cost will be £3,030,000 in 1907, £3,140,000 in 1911, and £3,465,000 in 1921. Without the deductions the figures will be £29,000,000, £13,000,000, and £8,000,000 respectively. We have to recognise that to-day there are 250,000 men who receive £10,500,000 as pensioners in the Army, Navy, Civil Service, local authorities, and similar bodies. In addition to these 250,000 people there are also those who receive pensions from trade unions and friendly societies. We shall have to consider, in relation to any start they may make, and perhaps rule out, those whose pensions from these and other sources range from £34 to £94 per annum. These are practical details to which the Government are devoting their energies. We are told that we can save materially from the Poor Law. I do not believe it. I believe that at the outside we cannot save more than from one to two millions. The trade unionists and members of friendly societies who are now receiving superannuation allowance may object to being disqualified for a pension. If their objections are right, and, in the main, I believe they are right, the people who are receiving pensions higher would also take the same view, and the result will be that we should have a tremendous amount of friction and difficulty, reorganisation, and adaptability of means to end that would give any Department charged with this duty a considerable amount of trouble. The Government are pledged by the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on April

18th, and on the strength of that promise which, I think, may be considered by everybody as a pledge, the Government, through me, accept the principle embodied in this old-age pension scheme now before the House, but we cannot be either pledged or committed to the plan, the details, the organisation, or the cost of the scheme introduced in this Bill. Subject to that limitation the Government support the principle and I trust that the promoters of this measure will be content with the promise and pledge I have given on behalf of the Government.

MR. W. H. LEVER rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the House is prepared to come to a decision.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 232; Noes, 19. (Division List No. 165.)

### AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beale, W. P.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, CH. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W.H. (St. Pancras, N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hunt, Rowland
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelly, George D.
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Kimber, Sir Henry
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sheehy, David
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W.T. (Westhoughton)
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. William Lever and Sir Francis Channing.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Bowles, G. Stewart
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Russell, T. W.
Turnour, Viscount

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Harold Cox and Sir Frederick Banbury.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Bill committed to a Committee of the whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. William Lever*).

---

### ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

Amendments proposed—

"In Clause 4 after the word 'fund,' to insert the words 'in the case of the City of London out of the consolidated rate of that City."

"In Clause 6, to leave out sub-section (1), and to insert the words—'(1) Within the City of London, the mayor, aldermen and commons of that City, in common council assembled, and within the county of London outside the City of London the London County Council."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Amendments agreed to:

Bill to be read the third time upon Friday, 14th June.

---

### TELEGRAPH [MONEY.]

Committee to consider of authorising the issue, out of the Consolidated Fund, of sums for the purpose of the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1906 (King's Recommendation signified), upon Monday next.—(*Mr. Herbert Lewis.*)

---

### PENRITH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing order No. 3.

Adjourned at sixteen minutes after Five o'clock till Monday next.

# HOUSE OF LORDS.

*Monday*, 13*th May*, 1907.

The Lord **Howard de Walden** took the Oath.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The **Lord Chancellor** acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Boston Spa Gas; Burnley Corporation; Shanklin Gas; Bristol Corporation; Brighouse Corporation.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [H.L.].—Presented, and read $1^{a}$.

Cavehill and Whitewell Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Report from the Select Committee, That the Promoters do not intend to proceed further with the Bill: Ordered that the Bill be not further proceeded with.

Midland Railway Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

North British Railway Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

North East London Railway Bill.—Read $2^{a}$, and committed for To-morrow.

Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Committed.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read $1^{a}$; and referred to the Examiners.

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, etc.) Bill [H.L.].—Read $2^{a}$ (according to order).

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.—Brought from the Commons, and read $1^{a}$; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 54.)

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Code of regulations for continuation classes providing further instruction for those who have left school, 1907.

### TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3777. United States (Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky).
No. 3778. Italy (Sicily).
No. 3779. France (Corsica).
No. 3780. France (Dunkirk.)
No. 3781. Italy (Genoa).

### MINES AND QUARRIES (GENERAL REPORT AND STATISTICS FOR 1906) (PART I. DISTRICT STATISTICS).

Statistics of the persons employed, out-put, and accidents at mines and quarries in the United Kingdom, arranged according to the inspection districts.

### RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Returns of accidents and casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several railway companies in the United Kingdom, during the three months ended 31st December, 1906; together with Reports of the inspecting officers, assistant inspecting officers, and sub-inspectors of the railway department to the Board of Trade upon certain accidents which were inquired into. Part II. Reports on accidents.

### EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Return of evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st March, 1907.

### INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1907–1908).

Explanatory memorandum by the Secretary of State for India.

### AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Reports and tables relating to Irish migratory agricultural labourers, for the year 1906.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

### LUNACY.

Report to the Lord Chancellor of the number of visits made, the numbers of patients seen, and the number of miles travelled by the visitors of lunatics, pursuant to the Lunacy Act, 1890, from 1st October 1906, to 31st March, 1907.

### POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST) (CONSTANTINOPLE AND SMYRNA TO EGYPT AND BEYOND).

The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 5) Warrant, 1907, dated 25th April, 1907.

### SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (COUNTY OF LANCASTER).

Order made by the council of the county of Lancaster, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the Clayton-le-Moors, Oswaldtwistle, and Church Urban Districts.

### INDIA.

(Finance and Revenue Accounts)—Finance and Revenue accounts of the Government of India, for the year 1905–1906.

(Home Accounts)—Home Accounts of the Government of India.

(Progress and Condition)—Statement exhibiting the moral and material progress and condition of India during the year 1905–1906. Forty-second Number.

(Estimate)—Estimate of revenue and expenditure of the Government of India for the year 1906–1907, compared with the results of 1905–1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

---

## HOUSE OF LORDS REFORM.

The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I beg to ask the noble Marquess the Leader of the House a Question of which I have given him private notice, namely, whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to take part in the proceedings of the Select Committee which the House on the 7th instant decided, on Lord Cawdor's Motion, to appoint. I ask this Question because there is a certain amount of doubt as to the intention of His Majesty's Government. The noble Earl the Lord President of the Council at the outset of the debate stated distinctly that it would be useless for His Majesty's Government to take part in the deliberations of the Committee, and the Amendment which he subsequently moved pointed clearly in that direction; but the concluding words of the noble Marquess towards the end of the debate were not quite in accord with the earlier statement. The noble Marquess said—

> "Therefore we feel that you should wait until you know what are the principles of the proposals of the Government in regard to differences between the two Houses, and then, with full knowledge of the facts of the case, proceed upon the inquiry which you desire."

The inference from the noble Earl's statement was that there should be no discussion until provision had actually been made for adjusting differences between the two Houses, while the inference from the noble Marquess's statement was rather that no discussion should take place until the Government proposals had been made known. The two things are not quite the same, and I should be glad if the noble Marquess could remove that element of doubt. I take this opportunity of asking him a further Question of which I have given him notice, namely, whether he is able to tell us how soon the Committee appointed on the Motion of Lord Burghclere to inquire into the Standing Orders of debate is expected to meet.

*The LORD PRIVY SEAL (the Marquess of Ripon): My Lords, the distinction which my noble friend has drawn between what was said by myself and by the Lord President seems to me extremely subtle. My noble friend will recollect that when I made my speech the other night it was under severe pressure. I was informed that some dreadful thing would happen if I did not stop at a particular time, and, in order to avoid that catastrophe, I was careful to say as little as I decently could. But I did not at all intend to contradict what fell from my noble friend the Lord President of the Council. The view we take is that the inquiry of the Committee—and your Lordships having passed the Resolution appointing the Committee, I say it with all respect—is inopportune, and, that being so, in our judgment it would be quite out of place, indeed it would place us in a false position, if we were to take any part in the Committee. That, I hope, is a sufficiently distinct Answer. With regard to the other Question, I have been in communication with Lord Burghclere, and it has been agreed that it would be convenient to hold the first meeting of the Committee upon rules of debate on the first Thursday after the re-assembling of the House after Whitsuntide.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: The noble Marquess says he is not prepared to take part in the Committee to which Lord Newton's Bill and other proposals are to be referred. Does he also intend to advise his friends behind him to take no part in that Committee?

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I spoke for Members of the Government. I do not in the least intend to exercise any influence, if I have any, over my noble friends behind me.

## SAILORS' VOTES.

LORD MUSKERRY rose to call attention to the disabilities of mariners in recording their votes, and to move to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House His Majesty's Government should appoint a Committee to consider and report as to feasible schemes, either by means of proxy voting or otherwise, which would tend towards removing these disabilities."

The noble Lord said: My Lords, the grievance I bring to the notice of your Lordships is a very genuine one, and I feel sure that it will command your entire sympathy; for it is only consistent with reason and justice that, if we compel our seafaring population to contribute their quota to the National Exchequer, we should at least give them some opportunity to record their views on the government of the country, just as other classes of the community in more fortunate circumstances ashore claim their vote as a right and exercise it as such.

For reasons which will be obvious to your Lordships, mariners are at present, to all intents and purposes, disfranchised. And yet their calling is one upon which the British Empire mainly depends. Take away our merchant service and where should we be? And I would remind your Lordships of our seafarers in the Royal Navy, who have just as much right to their Parliamentary votes as men employed in dockyards and other naval establishments ashore. At times our seamen, both of the Royal Navy and the merchant service, receive great praise and admiration, but, when they ask to be given an opportunity to exercise the franchise, their request meets with a good deal of apathy. Yet to a certain extent the Legislature has already accepted the principle of giving special facilities to mariners to record their votes. Over six years ago the Second Reading of a Bill for this purpose was carried in another place by a majority of no less than 103. The Motion that it should be committed to the Standing Committee on Law was opposed by the late Lord Ritchie—then sitting in the House of Commons as a member of the Government—and was, in consequence, unfortunately lost by twenty-nine votes. This gave sore disappointment to seafarers, but by means of private Bills of Members they continued the struggle but without any luck in the ballot. Three years later Sir Elliott Lees succeeded in getting the first place for a Resolution on the question, and it formed the subject of an evening's debate. The then Government were sympathetic in the matter, and would, I understand, have agreed to appoint a Committee of inquiry; but the Resolution was over-loaded by a very mistaken Amendment of Mr. Bell, which included railway workers and others, and the efforts of those working for seafarers were again frustrated. It was pointed out that the grievance on the part of the mariners was far the greatest, and that anything done for them would be a useful precedent for others. But all to no purpose. Negotiations, however, continued, and ultimately the following reference to a Committee was agreed to by the different parties interested—

> "Parliamentary Elections (Mariners', Fishermen's and Railway Servants' Votes).—That a Select Committee be appointed to consider and report whether any practical facilities can be provided whereby mariners, fishermen, and railway servants may record their votes in advance at Parliamentary elections, when by reason of their calling they will be absent at sea or on duty on the day of the poll, and whether it is advisable to provide such facilities."

The then Government were not averse to the appointment of this Committee if agreed to by the Commons, but they could give no time for a discussion on the matter. On the first occasion when the appointment of a Committee was formally moved it was objected to by Mr. Caldwell, who eventually withdrew his opposition. Yet this did not serve, for, on the Motion being again formally introduced, Sir Frederick Banbury entered an objection and declined to remove it, and the hopes of seafarers were once again dashed to the ground. Your Lordships will therefore see that unless His Majesty's Government are prepared to give that material assistance to seamen which they can give without any difficulty there is little chance of bringing about a most desirable and necessary reform.

I do not think there is any necessity for elaboration of my case. The justice of it cannot be questioned. I will quote one instance which has come to my notice, and which is common to a great number of mariners. A commander of one of our largest merchant ships has been a householder for twenty years, but, as yet, has never been able to record his vote. When at home on one occasion he was required to proceed from his residence in the South of England to look after a steamer which was in course of building for his firm in Scotland. During his absence from home he was summoned to serve on a jury, and for non-attendance was fined £10. Through his solicitor it was partly refunded, though his absence cost him £5. This self-same shipmaster points out that last year he was unable to record his vote by a few days, whereas the doctor on his vessel, a young man who had only lately left his University, was able to send his proxy vote from Marseilles. There is no equity in treatment of this kind.

We specially legislate for the blind, the illiterates, and the Jews in the matter of the franchise, but we entirely ignore such a capable, intelligent, and worthy man as the British sailor. In him we find our first line of defence, to him we look for our food supplies; without him, we in these islands would be starving within the space of a few weeks. Even a comparatively small maritime country like Norway makes special provision for her sailors in the way of recording their votes. And yet we, who have the greatest and most progressive mercantile marine the world has ever seen, give no helping hand to those upon whom we are so supremely dependent.

I am, of course, well aware of the difficulties which beset us in this matter, but I venture to submit that it is at least our duty to our seafaring fellow-subjects to make some conscientious endeavour either to overcome these difficulties or to meet them as far as we possibly can. If no satisfactory solution can be found I think that the suggestion of constituting special seafaring constituencies should be taken into consideration. The calling of a seaman is peculiar to itself and is, I would urge upon your Lordships, one requiring special and peculiar treatment. It is the height of inconsistency and injustice that a comparatively unimportant constituency of some two or three thousand votes should have the right to a Parliamentary representative when the men serving in the two greatest services of our Empire are denied any facilities whatever to take part in its political affairs.

I feel I am not unreasonable in asking for the formation of a Committee to enable us seriously to tackle this most important question. I have avoided statistics and suggestions, as statistics are really immaterial and suggestions are better thrashed out by a Committee of the kind I ask for. Whatever the result of their deliberations might be—and I do not see why they should be in any way futile—it would at least show our brethren on the sea that we are not entirely unmindful of them. Owing to their lack of political representation they merit all the more consideration and sympathy from your Lordships' House, and I trust to learn that His Majesty's Government—who, I must say, have so far given a good deal of consideration to the sailor—will give their most favourable consideration to the proposal which I now bring before your Lordships.

Moved to resolve, "That in the opinion of this House His Majesty's Government should appoint a Committee to consider and report as to feasible schemes, either by means of proxy voting or otherwise, which would tend towards removing disabilities of mariners in recording their votes."—(*Lord Muskerry.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, the question which has been raised by my noble friend has already been discussed on several occasions in the House of Commons. In 1904, as the noble Lord has stated, Sir Elliott Lees moved a Resolution in somewhat the same form. In the course of that debate Sir Elliott Lees stated that there were about 254,000 seamen of different kinds. He could not tell how many were voters, but on the whole he thought that there would be about 50,000. Mr. Bell afterwards moved that engine drivers, guards, and other railway servants should be included. I think he estimated there were 76,000 railway guards and engine drivers and that only about 25 per cent. of them were able to exercise their vote. I understand that Mr. Long offered no objection to the formation of the proposed Committee. The whole matter seems to me to be a very complex one. There is beyond question a certain hardship in seamen being unable to record their votes. I notice that in New Zealand a measure has been passed lately to meet the case of seamen recording their vote. I should like to bring to the notice of my noble friend a Bill which has been introduced in another place entitled the Absent Voters Bill, and which has for its object affording facilities for voting at Parliamentary elections to sailors, fishermen, and others whose vocations make them liable to habitual absence from home. I suggest that the noble Lord should try to get this Bill pressed forward in the House of Commons. I think that in every way that would be a better course than the appointment of a Committee. If the noble Lord has not seen this Bill I shall be glad to send him a copy. I trust that, in the circumstances, he will not press his Motion.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I understand from the noble Earl who has just spoken on behalf of His Majesty's Government, that there is a Bill in another place dealing with this matter. The noble Earl calls upon the noble Lord who raised this question to use his influence with that Assembly to get the Bill passed, but I think it more natural to call upon the Government and the Front Opposition Bench to use their influence in that direction. If the Government will give facilities to secure the passing of the measure in another place, it is highly improbable that when it reaches this House it will meet with opposition.

The greatest blot on the history of England has been her treatment of her seamen. At a time when the arrest of a civilian would have raised throughout the country an outcry sufficient to overturn a Government, seamen were being pressed and sent to sea against their will, flogged as much as the captain thought proper, caned as much as the boatswain considered necessary, and rope's-ended at intervals by the captains of their tops. Furthermore, they were fed on bad food by fraudulent contractors, kept waiting for their pay for years, and, worst of all, compelled to live at close quarters with gaol-birds who had been sent from prisons to fill up the complements of our ships.

A century has passed since those days. The seaman's hardships have been considerably lessened, but there is still a differentiation between the liberties of the seaman and the landsman to the disadvantage of the former. The workingman on shore has the franchise and is able to make use of it; the seaman is nominally in possession of it, but, in consequence of his frequent absence from home, is unable to exercise it. Is there any class on shore whose duties are as important and as useful to the country as those of the captains, officers, engineers, and seamen of the Royal Navy and the merchant service that is without Parliamentary representation? Why, it is on our commerce that we depend, not only to procure us food, but the income to buy that food. Yet the best of our working bees connected with that commerce remain as much unnoticed by Parliamentary candidates as if they had lived a century ago.

If any proofs are required to show the necessity of extending the seaman's possibilities of voting they are to be found in the history of the Merchant Shipping Act passed last year. The three great grievances of the seamen were—first, insufficient and badly-cooked food; secondly, delay in payment of wages; thirdly, unhealthy quarters with insufficient space to live in. When that Bill was first introduced into Parliament it was a much better Bill, as far as the seamen were concerned, than it was when passed. The shipowners, who are well represented in both Houses, succeeded in getting a number of Amendments accepted by the Government, as regards both payment of wages and housing space, which will have the effect of rendering illusory the greater part of the benefits that the Bill as originally drawn would have conferred on seamen. Had mariners been in a position to record their votes this would probably not have happened. I endeavoured to remedy these grievances by moving Amendments in this House. I believe that several of them would have been accepted here, had it not been that a compromise had been made with a group of shipowners in another place, and the acceptance of my Amendments at so late a period of the session might have wrecked the Bill.

But if seamen had had any voting power there would have been another Parliamentary group who, owing their seats to the seamen's votes, might have successfully opposed the shipowners. But there was only one man that I know of who had a seat in another place who was considered to represent seamen—Mr. Havelock Wilson. His views on many points are strongly antagonistic to those of a great number of mariners; so much so, indeed, that an association called the Mercantile Marine Guild, which has a membership of several thousand, was founded for the express object of opposing him; therefore large numbers of voteless mariners were left without any exponent of their opinions. At present the chances of an officer or seaman on active service being able to vote are so small that agents scarcely trouble themselves to put them on the register. It would be otherwise if proxies were allowed.

My suggestion is that every officer and man, whether in the Royal Navy or in the mercantile marine, who is on the register, should have power to fill up an official form, which should be noted on the register, giving some proxy in his neighbourhood the right to vote for him at any Parliamentary election after 4 p.m. for a certain number of years. This would leave the seaman an opportunity of voting in person if he were anywhere near at the time of an election. If he did so the proxy, on appearing at the polling booth after 4 p.m., would be told that the proxy vote could not be received. Some people consider that if you admit proxies for seamen you must do so for other professions. I do not agree with them. In other professions some few individuals may occasionally be prevented from voting who would probably be able to record their votes at the next election. But, in the case of seamen, the whole profession is permanently disfranchised. I appeal, not only to the Members of this House, but to all those who already possess the franchise, to take the earliest opportunity of doing an act of justice to seamen.

THE MARQUESS OF LANDSOWNE: I hope we are right in inferring from the statement of the noble Earl opposite that His Majesty's Government will do what they can to facilitate the progress of the Bill to which he referred in another place. To suggest that my noble friend who moved the Motion should procure the passing of the Bill, or, indeed, any other Bill, considering the legislative programme before Parliament, is really a proposal with which I do not think my noble friend behind me should be put off. Therefore, unless we hear something to the contrary, we shall infer that His Majesty's Government will do what they can to advance the Bill in question.

**THE MARQUESS OF RIPON**: My noble friend is indeed a tempter. He took us to task rather sharply the other day for taking up other people's Bills. That is exactly what my noble friend now proposes. All I can say is that the experience of last session does not lead me to think that to take up other people's Bills would be a profitable course for the Government to pursue at the present moment.

**LORD MUSKERRY**: I would point out, with regard to the Bill to which reference has been made, that it has been three months getting to the Second Reading stage, and it has not yet been read a second time. I therefore ask His His Majesty's Government to consent to the appointment of the Committee for which I move. The Committee need not be immediately appointed, and if the Bill in another place passes there will be no need for the Committee to sit. But if it is thrown out I submit there will be every reason for the Committee, and I therefore ask your Lordships to assent to my Motion.

On Question, Motion negatived.

## SUGAR BEET INDUSTRY.

**THE EARL OF DENBIGH**: My Lords, I rise to ask His Majesty's Government whether in view of their expressed desire to promote remunerative employment in agricultural districts and check the exodus to the towns, they are now prepared seriously to encourage the establishment of a sugar beet industry in the British Isles, and thereby ensure that a portion of the £18,000,000 now paid annually for imported sugar shall be available for labour in rural districts at home; whether they realise that the main obstacles to the introduction of the capital necessary for the erection of factories are; (1) the threatened imposition of a heavy excise duty on any home-grown sugar; (2) the attitude of individual members of the Government towards the Brussels Convention and the possible re-introduction of bounty-fed sugar; and whether His Majesty's Government will now, by a rebate of excise for a term of years, accord to an English sugar industry the same encouragement as has been given to Irish tobacco, and also give such an assurance on the subject of the Brussels Convention as will tend to remove the feeling of uncertainty now prevailing.

I ventured last year to draw the attention of the House to this question, and I am afraid I spoke at rather an unconscionable length. I can assure the House that I have no intention of making a long speech this evening. I have given notice of this Question on account of the additional interest which is being taken in the sugar beet industry in this country, and also on account of the desire which has been expressed by members of the Government to do something to stop the depopulation of the agricultural districts. I believe that this industry, if once started in this country, would do much to remedy those evils which are so much complained of. Agrculturists generally are very anxious that some step forward should be taken. I called your Lordships' attention last year to the fact that there were something like 50,000,000 tons of beetroot grown every year on the Continent, and that there were from four to five million acres under beet. The cultivation of sugar beet increases the fertility of the soil and gives a larger yield of succeeding crops, and it provides a most valuable cattle food in the residue of the beetroot. We have to face the fact that the raw sugar beet is not a good cattle food, and cannot be economically grown for any other purpose except the making of sugar; therefore you cannot expect people to grow large quantities in this country experimentally, except for that purpose, and for the making of sugar you want factories. That is the position in which we stand at present.

All experiments show that English beet is quite equal, if not superior, to that grown by continental nations, but we are faced with the want of capital. In order to put up a sugar factory, a capital of at least £70,000 would be required. I pointed out last year the great difficulties in starting this industry; I demonstrated that new factories established here could not hope to compete at the outset with the old-established factories on the continent, and I asked His Majesty's Government whether they would promise a rebate of excise duty in order to enable the industry to get upon its legs and be firmly established in this country. I received a certain amount of sympathy from His Majesty's Government, but I was met with a blank refusal, the reason for that refusal being that my proposals were described as savouring of protection. I can only say that that is not an excuse which is likely to commend the present fiscal policy of His Majesty's Government to the agriculturists of the country.

The noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture then tried to prove that sugar-beet could not yield a profit of more than £3 per acre, and that the farmers, therefore, would not think it worth while to cultivate it. But the farmer's profit depends upon the price he can get for his beet, and the price which the sugar factories will pay for the beet will depend upon the price they get for the finished article. If you are going at the outset to charge the full excise duty, either the factory must forego a considerable amount of profit, thereby rendering it more difficult to get the capital, or else they cannot afford to pay the farmers a price which would constitute an inducement to them to start beet-growing.

After having been told that His Majesty's Government would not listen to this proposal because it savoured of protection, it was very interesting to us later on in the session to find that this concession had been allowed in regard to the growing of tobacco in Ireland. When I inquired how it was that the Ministerial conscience had permitted this concession, I was told by the Lord President of the Council, first, that there was no analogy between the case of tobacco and sugar-beet, and, secondly, that His Majesty's Government only wanted to prove that tobacco could be grown and that, as soon as that was done, they had the fullest intention of taxing it up to the full capacity. We will wait and see what the Irish Council has to say about that. We admire the Lord President's wide knowledge on so many subjects, but I have no doubt he has not had very much time to give to the technical details of a new agricultural industry. I can assure him that, if he thinks that the matter has been definitely proved and that the industry is certain to be a success in this country, simply because we find we can successfully grow small plots of sugar beet, he is suffering from faulty information and is very greatly mistaken. There is a great deal to be done yet before it is proved that the beet-sugar industry can be established. The first factory put up in this country will be absolutely experimental. Of course, we know what the machinery is that is used on the Continent, and we know the methods adopted for making sugar from beetroot; but, as it will be an entirely new departure, the first sugar factory put up in this country must be an interesting, though a most important, agricultural experiment. If it is successful it will lead to many more, and I respectfully suggest that it is surely worth while for His Majesty's Government to strain a point in order to assist the establishment of the first factory.

The great obstacle to the introduction of capital for this industry, apart from the question of price, is the attitude of various members of the Government towards the Brussels Sugar Convention. It is unnecessary to refer to the long negotiations and arguments which eventually led up to that Convention; but I should like, in view of the attempts which are made by many supporters of His Majesty's Government to secure a return to the sugar bounty system, to remind your Lordships that by nobody have these sugar bounties been more emphatically condemned than by Leaders of the Party opposite. The Prime Minister, speaking on this subject, said—

> "I regard bounties as merely another form of protective duties. . . . These bounties appear to me to be bad; they disturb trade, hinder the development of the country, and, above all, punish the very nations which employ them; so I do not know what there is to be said in favour of them."

Mr. Gladstone was equally condemnatory of bounties. He said—

> "We do not regard with any satisfaction the system under which an artificial advantage is given in our markets to the products of foreign labour. . . . Some people say it is a good thing because the consumer gets the benefit, but no benefit founded on injustice and inequality can bring good to the consumer."

In view of those extracts and the inherent badness of the bounty system, and also of the fact that it is to the Brussels Convention and the abolition of the bounties that we owe the possibility of being able to start the sugar beet industry in this country, I do not think it is unreasonable to ask His Majesty's Government to give us some clear declaration of their intention on the subject.

I do not ask them to pledge themselves to any definite adherence to the Convention as it stands, but 1 do ask them, when negotiating on the subject, not to agree to any provisions permitting the re-establishment of bounties or of what is known as the cartel system. The cartel system which prevailed abroad is very nearly as harmful to the sugar industry in other countries as direct bounties. Under this system sugar factories combined together for raising the price to the home consumer, so that they were able to sell their surplus to the British consumer at a price very often below the cost of manufacture. They were only able to maintain this system by the fact that they had import duties which were very largely in excess of the excise duties, so that it did not pay to import sugar from outside for the purpose of competing with them. But by the Brussels Convention the surtax was limited expressly to 2s. 6d. per cwt., and therefore, the cartels have been practically knocked out. There is no doubt that when the Convention is reconsidered very strong influences will be brought to bear to re-establish the cartels and, to a certain extent, direct bounties. If these influences win the day, those who may have invested capital in the establishment of sugar factories in this country would be entirely at the mercy of foreign trusts, and I do not think it is unreasonable to ask that His Majesty's Government should give some assurance that they will protect investors in this country from that unfair competition.

Unfortunately, soon after the Brussels Convention was signed there was a very short beet crop on the Continent. The consumption did go up on the Continent in consequence of the Convention, because sugar became cheaper to the continental consumer, but then the short beet crop took place, and there was a sudden abnormal rise in price. Naturally the opportunity was rather too good a one to be lost, and certain politicians in this country ignored all the teachings of their leaders on the subject of artificial cheapness and the inequalities of bounties, and attributed the rise in the price of sugar to the machinations of the wicked Tory Government. The result is that various members of His Majesty's Government have declared, in the strongest terms, that they intend to do all they possibly can to upset the Brussels Convention on the first opportunity. Therefore, your Lordships will recognise what a state of uncertainty His Majesty's Government have created in this matter.

Before I sit down I should like to point out how the industry is going ahead in America. In the United States in the last thirteen years the sugar produced has risen from 20,000 tons in 1894 to 433,000 tons last year, and although that has been the result of a very heavy protective tariff and is not a fair comparison with anything that is likely to obtain in this country, still it shows at any rate the importance which is attached to this industry in other countries. The other day an interesting report was published by Reading College upon experiments that were carried on in Buckinghamshire, and in that report reference was made to the great success which had attended those efforts and to the impossibility of doing anything further without factories There was a large and important meeting of farmers at Ripon not very long ago and they made particular inquiries into this industry. Steps have also been taken in Lincolnshire, and the East Suffolk Chamber of Agriculture have issued important information upon it On all hands agriculturists in this country are considering this industry, and are waiting for some encouragement from His Majesty's Government. Something like £18,000,000 goes out of this country every year in payment for imported sugar. If only £1,000,000 of that sum could be spent in the agricultural districts here it is not difficult to see what a great amount of good would be done.

There is much talk of getting people back to the land, and we are told that the remedy is in small holdings; but one of the great difficulties in regard to small holdings is the fact that in many instances a man cannot live on his small holding alone, and it is absolutely necessary for him to have some other means of subsistence. In the beet industry you have it, because it is the only important agricultural industry which provides employment in the winter as well as in the summer. In the summer they have employment on the land, and in the winter in the factories. Again, you have already established labour colonies, and the humble individual in the neighbourhood of these colonies who grows cabbages for the market finds himself considerably injured by the State-aided cabbages which are thrown on the market. But in this beet industry you compete with nobody in this country, and a remission of excise would not tend to raise prices to the home consumer. It would be impossible for the most advanced free trader to say that under such a system your food would cost you more. I earnestly suggest that what has been done for Irish tobacco might perfectly well be done for English beet.

His Majesty's Government are believers in stimulating influences. I do not know whether it would be wrong to suggest that the Irish concession was granted under the influence of Irish ginger. Will it be necessary for English agriculturists to resort to similar means before His Majesty's Government will move in the matter? I hope that the question will receive the attention which it merits; that, at all events, His Majesty's Government will give earnest consideration to it, and do everything possible to let us have practical evidence as to whether or not the industry could be made successful in this country.

Lord DENMAN: My Lords, the noble Earl in the course of his speech made what was to us, on this side of the House, a very interesting admission, namely, that in his opinion the Irish Council Bill will pass through your Lordships' House. In this House, I represent the Irish Office as well as the Treasury, and I am very grateful to the noble Earl for the comfort he has given me on this point to-night.

*The Earl of Denbigh.*

This is not the first time that the noble Earl has raised the question of the sugar beet industry. Last year he brought the matter forward, and I gave him a direct statement in reply. He has asked the question again now, but has brought forward no new fact and no further combination of circumstances to show why the Government should reconsider the decision they came to last session. In replying for the Government on that occasion, I pointed out the difficulty the Government might have of withdrawing the rebate if once they had allowed it, and that view was endorsed by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, who said that the doctrine that infant industries might be encouraged by the State during the earlier stages of their career was one which must be applied with very great caution indeed, because experience had shown that those industries were apt to have the secret of eternal youth. It is obvious that industries which are unable to stand upon their own merits must be a source of anxiety to any Government, and experience shows that, once a rebate has been granted, it is not found possible to withdraw the rebate on the date originally intended.

I will not go into the free trade arguments of the question, because I am well aware that I am addressing a protectionist House; but I will repeat one argument which I used on the last occasion, namely, that if we grew sugar in this country by means of a rebate, and undersold the West Indian planter, we should be dealing a very severe blow, probably a death blow, at our West Indian trade. At present this trade shows every symptom of being an increasing and prosperous trade, and last year 500,000 cwts. more of West Indian sugar came into this country than the year before. Another argument is this: the existing duty on sugar is 4s. 2d. per cwt., and, so far as I know, there is no probability in the near future that the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be in a position to mitigate that tax. But if we built up a sugar industry in this country by means of a rebate, the Chancellor would have to continue the sugar tax simply in order to give the rebate.

The noble Earl has asked what our attitude is towards the Brussels Convention, and he animadverted on the action of certain politicians in the matter. It was not alone by politicians, let me remind the noble Earl, that the Brussels Convention was disliked. It was loathed and detested by all the sugar-using trades. There are still at the Treasury protests in no measured terms from important bodies representing those trades. I will read to your Lordships an extract from one of the communications received at the Treasury, which will show what the attitude of the sugar-using trades was—

> "Despite all the professions of the authors the price of a prime necessity to the poor has been doubled, and the purchasing power of the worker's wage has thus been lessened; great industries are threatened with ruin, honest traders have their position jeopardised, and the gaunt army of the unemployed has been increased."

This is from a gentleman who was president of a Mineral Water Manufacturers' Association, and it is a specimen of other protests showing the manner in which sugar-users generally regarded the Convention.

I myself have a particular reason for disliking the Convention. I own a number of shares—not many—in Indian tea companies. When the Brussels Convention was signed, as noble Lords will recollect, Russia was one of the countries which refused to come within the scope of the Convention. Russia felt herself injured to a certain extent by the action which we took in joining the Convention, and therefore she put a countervailing duty on tea grown in India and Ceylon. Therefore we, the shareholders in tea companies, and the unfortunate tea planters in India and Ceylon, had to pay for the benefits conferred upon this country by the Convention. I do not desire to dwell further on this point. I think we on this side of the House have given it as our opinion that there were errors in the conditions of the Brussels Convention; but that is, after all, past history. I think it would be in the power of any one of us on this side to make perhaps a bitter speech on this subject, but I will refrain from doing so.

The EARL OF DENBIGH: May I ask the noble Lord whether his argument is that he repudiates what has been said by the Leaders of his Party on the subject of bounties, and that he rather approves of bounties.

LORD DENMAN: I am not speaking on the subject of bounties at all. I do not see that it comes into my argument. I say that the members of His Majesty's Government adhere to the opinions which they have given with regard to the Convention. The noble Earl then asks what is to be the attitude of the Government when we come to consider the Convention, as we are bound to do, in the year 1908. I do not suppose that he really expects a definite reply on that point, and clearly he can hardly expect that on a side issue the Government are likely in this House to make a declaration of their policy on this question. After all, this is a matter of taxation, and it is essentially, therefore, a House of Commons question; and I have no doubt that when the time comes the Chancellor of the Exchequer will make a declaration on this point in the House of Commons and will obtain the verdict of that House upon it. As I have said, His Majesty's Government adhere to the opinions which they have expressed, and I think those opinions are pretty well known.

Then the noble Earl asks whether we will give the same encouragement to sugar beet growing as has been given to Irish tobacco. It appears to me that the noble Earl is under a strange misapprehension on that point. I would like to ask him what facilities have been given to Irish tobacco growers that English beet growers do not already possess.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: Remission of excise.

LORD DENMAN: Until recently it was illegal to grow tobacco in Ireland at all, with the exception of certain small experiments on a small area. Permission for this was granted, and we extended the permission. Lately a Bill has been introduced—it is now before your Lordships' House—permitting tobacco to be grown in Ireland provided the excise conditions are imposed. Therefore, the beet grower in England is at present in a better position than the tobacco grower in Ireland, because he may freely carry out these experiments. Naturally we say that if you are going to cultivate this industry on a large scale we shall impose the excise duty, as we are bound to do to protect our revenue. On his own showing the noble Earl is asking for a great deal. Last year the noble Earl stated that the rebate on the industry on such a scale as he wished to see in this country would amount to about £400,000 a year. I asked him at the time how long he wanted it for, and he replied "From five to ten years." I think anyone going into business with the credit of the British Government at his back and with a cash present from the Treasury of some £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 would became a Standard Oil magnate very shortly. I have no doubt that the noble Earl is impervious to these or any other arguments that I may be in a position to bring forward. I can imagine him saying to himself, What matter the interests of the consumer, what matter the interests of low persons like bakers and confectioners, of base-born knaves such as mineral-water manufacturers, or unfortunate beings like tea-planters in Ceylon or sugar growers in the West Indies and British Guiana—what matter all these so long as it is possible, with great care and considerable pecuniary risk, and with rebates on taxes, to build up, I would rather say to bolster up, a necessarily restricted industry in these islands? Surely that is not a very comprehensive view to take of the needs of the Empire.

I am bound to say that, whatever we may think of the views of the noble Earl, we cannot but admire the enthusiasm with which he has carried out these experiments and the energy with which he has pressed the case on successive Governments. It must always be an uncongenial task to endeavour to damp the ardour of an enthusiast, and I can assure my noble friend that this has been no congenial task to me. But I must say that if this industry is to be absolutely dependent upon a rebate of taxes, then the noble Earl is engaged on a forlorn hope. I am not quite sure that it would not be possible to build up this industry without a rebate, and I have some reason for this belief in a paragraph about the beet industry which I read last night in the *Labour Record*, which states that—

> "In Lincolnshire, promoters, encouraged by the support received, are now engaged in making provisional contracts with farmers for the cultivation of this root. When an adequate supply is assured, the manufacture of sugar will be begun at a factory in Doddington."

Therefore I assume that there is a factory already in existence there.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: No.

LORD DENMAN: If, as I say, this industry is to be absolutely dependent upon a rebate, the noble Earl is engaged on a very forlorn hope indeed. He has received little encouragement either from the present Chancellor of the Exchequer or from the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. It seems to me that the noble Earl's only hope is to possess his soul in patience until the benches on which we now sit are occupied by a Labour Government. Until then I doubt whether the noble Earl will be in a position to wring from a reluctant Treasury the vast sums of money which, on his own showing, are indispensable to the successful cultivation of sugar beet in this country.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: My Lords, I do not know whether the noble Lord who has just sat down imagines that the cold water which he has poured on the noble Earl is really going to damp his enthusiasm.

LORD DENMAN: No.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY: The noble Earl has taken up this industry to the great advantage of agriculturists, and, even if he does have to wait till the happy millennium when we shall have a Labour Government in power, he need have no cause for relinquishing his labours or pressing this question on the Government of the day. I say this because—and I confess it with all humility—I have never heard a more inadequate answer to an important question given by any member of a Government. The only new argument which the noble Lord brought forward was that growers of sugar beet in this country would have opposition from our West Indian Colonies. I have had an opportunity this morning of refreshing my memory in regard to the last circular issued by the West India Committee. That Committee is a representative body consisting of all those concerned with these important Possessions of the Crown, and, in the course of a paragraph dealing with this question, the West India Committee observe that they would welcome any step that would help the British grower, because the result of the Brussels Sugar Convention had shown that with stability of prices cane sugar could always be grown at a profit in fair competition with beet sugar, and they would be glad to see a prospect—I do not suppose they would expect that prospect with the present Government in power—of sugar beet being grown at a profit by farmers in England.

The noble Lord repeated the old argument that this proposal savours of protection. It would not frighten me if it did, but I venture to say that there is really nothing in the proposal which my noble friend has brought forward that cannot be supported by the most extreme free trader. All that is asked for is some guarantee that the existing state of affairs as regards the Brussels Sugar Convention will continue. At the time when the Convention was passed there was considerable misapprehension as to what was desired by the West Indies. What they wanted was a levelling of prices. Prices used to fluctuate from 9s. a cwt. down to 7s.; but the Convention has inaugurated steadiness in the price of sugar, which has settled down to 9s. or 10s. per cwt. more or less; and I am confident what the answer would be if the noble Lord were to ask the traders whether they now wanted their industry again disturbed and made subject to these fluctuations.

With regard to tobacco growing in Ireland, the noble Lord who replied on behalf of the Treasury denied that any facilities had been given, and referred to a Bill which is now before your Lordships and which he justly observed merely removes the prohibition against tobacco growing in Ireland—a measure to which there can be no objection from any fiscal point of view. Indeed it is essentially a free trade measure. The noble Lord, however, forgot to mention that one-third of the excise duty on tobacco grown in Ireland has been remitted for a period of five years. That concession was made by the late Government, but it has not been withdrawn by the present free trade Government, but has been renewed for a further period of five years.

Lord DENMAN: The rebate applies only to a limited area of 100 acres. It is only an experiment, permission for which was granted by the late Government and which we carried on. We could not very well do otherwise.

Viscount RIDLEY: The granting of a concession of this kind is entirely within the province of a free trade Government, and all that my noble friend asks is that agriculturists in England should be given a similar concession.

Lord DENMAN: They can already carry on experiments in this country as they please. They do not want any permission from the Government.

Viscount RIDLEY: I am informed that sugar beet can be grown in small quantities in this country, but it has not been proved whether over a series of years sugar beet growing could be made a profitable industry. For the purpose of that experiment it is necessary to have some guarantee that the Brussels Convention will not be disturbed for a certain number of years; and, if possible, the concession which has been given to tobacco growers in Ireland should be given, also for experimental reasons, to sugar beet growers in England. The noble Earl at the head of the Board of Agriculture told us the other day that experiments were being made in regard to land in the direction of small holdings. I would suggest that the noble Earl might carry on experiments in sugar beet growing, if not on the remainder of his own land, at any rate on Crown lands, and endeavour to get capital invested in factories so as to start the industry on a sound footing. The Central Chamber of Agriculture have been pressing for some time for a Departmental Committee to consider this matter, but up to the present have received no response to that request. There are many ways in which the Government could show an inclination to meet this reasonable demand. It is admitted that people are leaving the land, and that agriculture wants a new stimulus. I submit that there is no industry more useful than the sugar beet industry in making small holdings profitable. Surely it is not too much to ask the Government to grant some facilities in this direction, and, if they cannot take active steps themselves, at the very least to appoint a Committee to go into the whole question.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, I only rise to make a very few observations in answer to what has fallen from the noble Viscount who has just sat down. My noble friend who represents the Treasury has replied very ably and clearly upon those important aspects of the Question which affect his Department. But the Question is so worded that there is hardly any Department which might not be called upon to take part in this conversation. The Board of Agriculture is affected, the Treasury is affected, the Colonial Office is affected, and, as so often happens in these cases, the Foreign Office finds itself in a way affected also.

I am inclined to think, looking at this Question as a whole, that I shall not be in any way misrepresenting the noble Earl when I say that the real sting of it is at the end, which is not unnatural. It may be called a reconnaissance in force to try to ascertain from His Majesty's Government what their intentions are in regard to the Sugar Convention. I can only say that in the opinion of the Government the time for stating them has not yet come. This much, however, I certainly can say, that they will always look at this question from the point of view of free trade—that great principle to maintain which they consider that this Parliament was returned and this Government formed.

I hope I may be excused, as representing only the Foreign Office, from following the noble Earl who asked the Question into the various complicated issues which it raises. At the beginning of the Question we are dazzled with a vision of giving remunerative employment to a vast number of people, and the noble Earl thinks he has the secret of, in some mysterious way, accomplishing that. My noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture has been attacked because he thinks he can improve the position of the labourer by establishing small holdings. But his plans are small and insignificant before the dazzling schemes of the noble Earl for the cultivation of beet-root. The noble Earl holds out a most striking and remarkable prospect, and I hope he will be able at some future time to justify the faith that is in him.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: Does the noble Lord assert that none of the money which is now paid for imported sugar would be spent in this country?

LORD FITZMAURICE: I venture to make no assertion of any kind. In the first place the Foreign Office has nothing to do with sugar; and, secondly, to prophesy is rash. The sugary vision of the noble Lord's Question becomes touched with acid as it proceeds, because there are suggestions as to the conduct of individual members of His Majesty's Government, and dark hints are thrown out as to the possibility of the Chancellor of the Exchequer imposing an excise duty on home-grown sugar. That brings me back to the point from which I started. If I had to reply to these points I naturally could only do so if I were able to explain to the House what the settled policy of the Government in regard to the Convention is. But, as I have said, the time for that has not yet come. The Convention will have to be considered by the Government in all its aspects within the present year; and in this House or elsewhere—by the Chancellor of the Exchequer I have no doubt—a full statement will be made, which I trust will be satisfactory to the country and to your Lordships.

---

## DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS BILL [H.L.].

Bill read 3a (according to order).

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH moved to insert, as a schedule to the Bill, so much of the text of the Destructive

Insects Act, 1877, as had not been repealed or varied by subsequent Acts of Parliament.

The noble Lord said: My Lords, before the Bill passes I would like to call your Lordships' attention to the terms and method in which it is drafted. They are singular and carry the practice which is known as legislation by reference a step or two further than it has ever been carried before. I have no doubt I shall be told that the proposal which I have placed on the Paper is without precedent. I shall not be alarmed at that, if I can show your Lordships that to make a new precedent would be for the convenience of those humble persons who have to understand the statutes which this House passes. If your Lordships will look at the Bill you will see that the only operative clause provides that—

> "The Board of Agriculture and Fisheries may for the purpose of preventing the introduction into Great Britain of any insect, fungus, or other pest destructive to agricultural or horticultural crops or to trees or bushes, and for preventing the spreading in Great Britain of any such insect, fungus, or other pest, exercise all such powers as may be exercised by the Board in relation to the Colorado beetle under the Destructive Insects Act, 1877."

The first point is that the Board of Agriculture had no powers under that Act, because the Board did not then exist. I suppose the powers have been transferred from the Privy Council to the Board of Agriculture by a subsequent Act, but the whole of the Act of 1877 refers to the Privy Council. The powers given under that Act for the particular purpose of it are of the most arbitrary nature. The Privy Council are empowered to regulate or prohibit the landing in Great Britain in any way that it chooses.

My point is this, that any person purchasing a copy of this Bill as it stands, should it become a statute, would find himself but a very short distance on his way to understanding it. He would find that he had to pursue his researches into the Act of 1877. Having purchased that Statute he would again find himself no further, because parts of it have been repealed by three subsequent Statutes—the Acts of 1878, 1889, and 1898, though the last only refers to Ireland, and he would have all this trouble because the draftsman or the Department for some reason or other finds it more convenient to refer in the present Bill to the original Act of 1877. I hope the Bill will not be opposed on its merits; but in the name of everything that helps the understanding of it, why is not so much of the Act of 1877 as is not repealed or varied set out in a schedule. It does seem to me inadvisable to put a wholly unnecessary burden upon market gardeners and agriculturists to understand unknown powers in the hands of the Department. I venture to make my protest against this method of legislation and to move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment moved—

> "To insert as a schedule so much of the text of the Destructive Insects Act, 1877, as has not been repealed or varied by subsequent Acts of Parliament.—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, I am glad to find that the Amendment is noved only with the object of initiating a discussion, and to show the desirability of consolidation. With that object, I think we shall all agree, but I might point to a great many Acts where the need for consolidation is greater. I would respectfully ask my noble friend not to press his Amendment, for the Bill is urgently needed, and has been approved on both sides. As to the comments on the manner in which the Bill is drawn, I ask the noble Lord what would be the useful result, if what he desires were carried out in schedules to small Bills of this sort. I do not think the noble Lord is himself absolutely innocent in this matter. He will remember that in 1901 he brought in a very useful measure which was called the Burgh Sewage, Drainage, and Water Supply (Scotland) Bill. The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1888; the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892; the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894; the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897; and the Town Council (Scotland) Act, 1900, were all referred to by name in the measure for which the noble Lord was himself responsible. I hesitate to think what would have been the result if all the Acts affected had been scheduled in that case.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: That is not my proposal. My proposal is simply to schedule one Statute so far as it is unrepealed; not the Acts mentioned in the Bill.

EARL CARRINGTON: What the noble Lord proposes is that there should be inserted as a schedule to this Bill so much of the text of the Destructive Insects Act, 1877, as has not been repealed or varied by subsequent Acts of Parliament. Upon that principle all the Acts referred to in that Scottish Bill would have been inserted. I hope the noble Lord will be satisfied with the discussion, and not check the progress of the Bill, which might have most serious results to agriculture.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: I rather hope the noble Lord will not be satisfied, and that either in this form or in another he will obtain for the House and the country some wording which will explain the meaning of the Bill. We are not now discussing the question of burgh sewage. I daresay that the noble Lord when he was Secretary for Scotland may have committed the iniquities to which the noble Earl has just referred, but what we want really to know is what is the meaning of this Bill. If the course which is now proposed by Lord Balfour is not the most convenient, surely there ought to be some means of explaining to the public and to the Houses of Parliament what the object of the Bill is. Can the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture tell the House what are the powers which may be exercised by the Board in relation to the Colorado beetle under the Destructive Insects Act, 1877? If he will not consent to the Amendment it would be easy to prefix a Memorandum to the Bill, stating the effect of the proposals, and for that purpose we might adjourn the next stage of the Bill for a few days.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, I think that so far as this particular Bill is concerned my noble friend the Minister for Agriculture has made good his ground. The Amendment would not, in my opinion, add to the clearness of the Bill, the perplexity of which would remain very much as it is. My noble friend said, with perfect truth, that the practice of legislation by reference is not confined to one side or to any Department, and it has been the frequent subject of protest by myself in the House of Commons during the last fifteen or twenty years. I hope that good may result from the discussion, for the practice has been carried to an extent which makes it difficult for plain men to understand the statute and tends to confine to the members of the legal profession the interpretation of Acts of Parliament. Probably the real source of the practice is the immense pressure of business in Parliament. In your Lordships' House it is possible to carry out consolidation in Bills, but in the other House they cannot do so.

EARL CAWDOR: I think the difficulty which arises is that many of your Lordships are not quite sure what the powers are that may be exercised by the Board of Agriculture in relation to the Colorado beetle under the Destructive Insects Act of 1877. The noble Earl is, of course, perfectly well aware what those powers are, and I think it would facilitate the passage of this Bill if the noble Earl would tell us in a few words exactly what those powers are.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: As there is no response to the request of Lord Cawdor, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Moved, That the debate be adjourned.—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I hope your Lordships will not stop the progress of this Bill, which confers great benefit on the agricultural population. My noble and learned friend on the Woolsack has stated his view in regard to the question of legislation by reference. I appeal to the House not to let agriculturists, who are affected by these pests, suffer because of the usual, though inconvenient, method of drafting being adopted in this instance.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I quite agree with the noble Marquess. There is no desire on my part to check the progress of this Bill. I have carefully examined the Statute to find out what portion of the Act of 1877 is repealed or altered, and it would have saved much trouble had the effect been shown. Perhaps the noble Earl will give an assurance that a Memorandum shall be prefixed showing the result.

EARL CARRINGTON: I will have that done with pleasure.

Motion for adjournment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

An Amendment (Privilege) made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

### EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING].

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, this is a small Bill which I think is sufficiently explained by the Memorandum prefixed to it. To repeat quite shortly the substance of that Memorandum, I may say that this Bill is necessary in order to repeal two obsolete exemptions under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, regarding the employment of women. The International Conference at Berne last year agreed to certain limitations with regard to the labour of women, and I think we in this country may congratulate ourselves upon the fact that only these two very small alterations have to be made in order to bring the laws of this country into harmony with the general agreement arrived at by the International Conference. I beg to move.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2$^a$.—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Bill read 2$^a$, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Monday, 13th May, 1907.*

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

## PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

### PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders, not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords]; Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [Lords]; Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

### PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [Lords]; Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill; Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords].—

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [Lords]; King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords]; Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [Lords]; Southend Water Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed.

London and North Western Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

---

### MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to :—

Falmouth Gas Bill, without Amendment; Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the union of the Methodist New Connexion, the Bible Christians, and the United Methodists Free Churches under the name of 'The United Methodist Church,' to deal with real and personal property belonging to the said churches or denominations, to provide for the vesting of the said property in trust for the United Church so formed, land for the assimilation of the trusts thereof; and for other purposes." [United Methodist Church Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board to purchase certain waterworks from the Skelmersdale Urban District Council; and for other purposes." [Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to make provision with reference to claims by policy holders and other persons against other companies or persons for compensation or payment in respect of injuries." [Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation, Limited, Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the construction of further waterworks and the taking of water from the River Bure for the purpose of affording increased supplies of water by the Great Yarmouth Waterworks Company and the Lowestoft Water and Gas Company, to confer further powers upon those companies with reference to their respective undertakings; and for other purposes." [Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the Selsey Water Company and to enable that Company to supply water in certain parishes in the county of Sussex." [Selsey Water Bill] [Lords.]

United Methodist Church Bill [Lords]; Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [Lords]; Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [Lords]; Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]; Selsey Water Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

---

## *PETITIONS.*

---

### EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS) BILL.

Petition from St. Marylebone, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from St. Marylebone, against; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Argyll, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Tattingstone, against; to lie upon the Table.

### PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAYS (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from St. Marylebone, in favour to lie upon the Table.

### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from Rhuddlan, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

## RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (ACCOUNTS AND ESTIMATES, 1907–8).

Copy presented, of Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS AND IRRIGATION WORKS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th May; *Mr. Robert Price*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 150.]

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 9th May; *Mr. Herbert Samuel*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 151.]

EVICTIONS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Return of the number of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (IRELAND) (MIGRATORY LABOURERS).

Copy presented, of Report and Tables relating to Irish Migratory Agricultural and other Labourers for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND.)

Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Continuation Classes providing further instruction for those who have left school, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).

Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 5) Warrant, 1907, dated 25th April, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3780 and 3781 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Copy presented, of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ended 31st December, 1906, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DAIRIES, COWSHEDS, AND MILKSHOPS (REGULATIONS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th February; *Dr. Rutherford*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 152.]

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

### Manufactured Goods Imported from the Colonies.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state what was the value of manufactures imported into this country from the self-governing Colonies in 1905.

MR. ASHLEY: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what was the value of manufactures imported into this country from British possessions in 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The value of articles wholly or mainly manufactured (including a small quantity of unclassified articles and parcel post) imported into the United Kingdom from the self-governing Colonies in 1905 was £5,250,000, and from all British possessions £16,500,000.

### Custody of Thomas Slevin, now in Rainhill Asylum.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the county asylum authorities at Rainhill, near Liverpool, have refused to transfer to an Irish asylum Thomas Slevin, who arrived in Liverpool violently insane on the royal mail steamer "Teutonic," and who was a passenger to Longford; and, in case his friends go for him to the asylum, will he direct that he be handed over to their custody with a view to his removal to Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have made inquiry in this case and I am informed by the asylum authorities that the patient is at present ill in bed and unfit to travel.

### Arrests on Suspicion at Fintown, County Donegal.

Mr. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that three men, Peter Boyle, James M'Monagle, and Owen Moy, of Fintown, county Donegal, were arrested on the 25th, 28th, and 31st December, respectively, on a charge of sheep-stealing, and were remanded to Derry Gaol, the granting of bail being opposed by the police; that at the petty sessions, held on the 4th January at Glenties, no evidence whatever was produced against Boyle or M'Monagle, and that Moy was also discharged by the magistrates on the ground that there was no evidence to connect him with the theft; was any effort made by the police to confront the accused either, for the purpose of identification, with the man from whom the sheep were stolen or with the person to whom they were alleged to have been subsequently sold, previously to these men being remanded to gaol or at any time before the 3rd January; have any disciplinary measures been taken with respect to the sergeant of police who made the arrests; and will he direct that in future the police shall not oppose the granting of bail in cases where they make arrests upon suspicion and are not in possession of any evidence to support a charge.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) The police authorities inform me that the three men referred to were arrested on 25th, 29th, and 31st December, respectively, and were remanded in custody to Glenties petty sesions on 4th January. The police did not oppose bail; it was not offered by any of the defendants. All three were discharged at petty sessions for want of evidence. The accused were not confronted with the persons mentioned in the Question. The owner of the sheep could not have identified them, as he did not see the sheep stolen, and the person to whom they were sold lived eighteen miles away. It was not clear, also, that the thieves were the persons who actually sold the sheep to the person in whose possession they were found. The absence of evidence was due to the fact that the persons who gave information to the police failed to support their statements. The Inspector-General is of opinion that no blame attaches to the police in the matter.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement of Terence Reilly.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what progress has been made towards reinstating Terence Reilly, of Cooldoney, Patrick Brady, of Aghnaganon, and Alice Connor, of Kilbride, all evicted tenants in the parish of Abbeylara, in the farms from which they were respectively evicted.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from both Terence Reilly and Alice Connor, but not from Patrick Brady. Reilly's case has been carefully inquired into, and the Commissioners have decided to take no action in it. Alice Connor's application was only recently received, and her case has not yet been investigated.

### Honorary Rank on Retirement of Brigadier-Generals.

Captain FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that two years ago there were only some twelve brigadier-generals doing duty at home, and that there are now about fifty, he can, considering the fact that it means no increase of pay, reconsider his determination of not allowing these officers to retain their rank on retirement, and so save them from the stigma of the present reduction in rank.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The number of brigadier-generals does not in any way affect the general principle of not granting honorary rank on retirement, There is no real stigma attaching to the reversion of a brigadier-general to his permanent rank.

### Married Quarters at Bulford Camp.

CAPTAIN FABER: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, with regard to the separation of married soldiers of the Scots Greys from their families, owing to there not being sufficient married accommodation at Bulford Camp, he will state the distance by high road, and also by rail, from Bulford to Tidworth; and whether the communication across the downs between those places is only by a track across the downs which is nearly impassable in winter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The distance by high road from Bulford to Tidworth is about seven miles and by rail about twenty-six miles. The communication across the downs is by track, a distance of four miles, but in inclement weather it is preferable for wheeled traffic to use the high road. I am, however, at present engaged in considering how the difficulty referred to in the Question can be got over. I am not as yet in a position to make a statement on the subject.

### Preparation of Reports of the Colonial Conference.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): To ask the Prime Minister whether the Colonial Office or the Imperial Conference are responsible for the issue of the Reports of the Imperial Conference.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: To ask the Prime Minister whether he can state the reason which has led those responsible for issuing the Reports of the Imperial Conference to give some speeches in much fuller detail than others.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: To ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the fact that the authorities responsible for issuing Reports of the Imperial Conference have admitted that the summary of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech at the Conference was incorrect, and having regard to the fact that the mistake was not noticed by those authorities for the space of three days, he will take steps to ensure that in the future less slovenly methods of reporting the proceedings of the Conference are adopted.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) Perhaps I may answer the other Questions of the noble Lord at the same time. I am not prepared to answer in detail questions relative to the procedure adopted by the Imperial Conference. The daily *précis* was prepared for the public convenience as efficiently as the time and pressure of work would allow. The Conference have decided to publish, as soon as possible, a full and verbatim Report of their proceedings.

### Sittings of the Departmental Committee on the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the Departmental Committee on the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill has recently been taking evidence from the chairman of the Metropolitan Gas Company on the question of profit sharing; whether he is aware that this gentleman has many times publicly given this evidence; whether he will therefore direct the Committee that they are not to take evidence where the same is available in Parliamentary Papers; will he say how long the Committee have been sitting, how many sittings have been held, and what are the instructions he has given to the Committee, if any, to expedite their Report; and whether any single member of this Committee has had any practical experience in the management of a colliery.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone*). I am informed by the Committee that the evidence taken from Sir George Livesey referred, not to the subject of profit-sharing, but to that of the institution of an eight-hour shift at the South Metropolitan Gas Works. The Committee commenced taking evidence on 3rd January, and finished on the 8th of this month, having held twenty-seven meetings in all. The Committee expect to place their Report in my hands this week, and it should be available for Members shortly after Whitsuntide. As regards the last part of the Question the Answer is in the affirmative.

### Speed of H.M.S. "Scylla" and "Indefatigable."

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the sea speed of H.M.S. "Scylla" and H.M.S. "Indefatigable."

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Sixteen knots under ordinary conditions.

### Naval Manœuvres.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is proposed to hold any naval manœuvres this summer; and, if so, whether he can state what fleets will take part.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The usual combined fleet exercises will take place, but the date is not yet definitely fixed.

### Members of Parliament and the Policy of the Charity Commissioners.

MR. MARKHAM: To ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division of Yorkshire, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether, seeing that the Charity Commissioners have stated that their policy is settled by influential Members of Parliament, he will point out to these Members of Parliament that their opposition against the sale of charity lands causes loss of income to charities; and will he ask them to withdraw their opposition so that for the future the Commissioners can act judicially.

MR. MARKHAM: To ask the hon. Member for the Elland Division of Yorkshire, as representing the Charity Commissioners, whether he is aware that Mr. W. B. N. Bird, of Eartham, Sussex, in November, 1906, agreed to purchase a piece of agricultural land from the trustees of St. Mary's Hospital for the sum of £1,400, the annual rental derived from such land being £30 6s. 8d., and that, though the said sale was provisionally approved by the Charity Commissioners in October, this confirmation was subsequently withdrawn in a letter dated November 8th, 1906, addressed by the Charity Commissioners to the solicitors of St. Mary's Hospital, on the grounds that influential Members of Parliament had made strong representations to them against the sale of charity lands; will he say who are these Members of Parliament; and whether other Members of this House will be given an equal opportunity to settle the policy of the Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Trevelyan.*) The policy of the Charity Commissioners is adverse to the selling of charity land except in special circumstances showing great advantage to the charity. That this has long been the policy of the Commissioners is shown by the evidence of Sir Henry Longley, the then Chief Commissioner before the Select Committee on the Charity Commission in 1894. It is not the case that the policy is settled by influential Members of Parliament. But evidence in support of it was given by Members before the Select Committee, and in the last two years further representations have been made by Members to the Commissioners against the sale of charity lands, especially in agricultural districts. In the case of St. Mary's Hospital, Chichester, the circumstances were that the proposed purchaser desired to acquire the land in question for sporting purposes and to consolidate his estate. The price offered seemed to the Commissioners insufficient, and they did not think that the object of rounding off a sporting property constituted such special circumstances as would make a sale desirable in the interests of the charity.

### Canadian and United States Tariffs on British Goods.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Excehquer, with reference to the official report of his address to the Imperial Conference, whether the burden of the Canadian tariff upon United Kingdom produee, as compared with United States produce, has been progressively altered since 1897, in favour of the United Kingdom.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The *ad valorem* equivalent of the duty actually imposed in Canada on all imports from the United States and United Kingdom, respectively, in each year since preferential treatment was first accorded to

United Kingdom produce, has been as follows—

| Year ended 30th June. | *Ad valorem* Equivalent on Goods Imported from | |
|---|---|---|
| | United States of America. | United Kingdom. |
| 1897 | 13 | 21 |
| 1898 | 13 | 20 |
| 1899 | 13 | 20 |
| 1900 | 12 | 18 |
| 1901 | 12 | 18 |
| 1902 | 13 | 17 |
| 1903 | 12 | 17 |
| 1904 | 13 | 18 |
| 1905 | 13 | 19 |
| 1906 | 13 | 19 |

### The Disturbances at Lahore.

Mr. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is a fact that the five Lahore barristers who have been arrested and kept in prison, bail being refused, and Lala Rajpat Rai, who has been deported and imprisoned, without trial, under an obsolete law of nearly a century ago, were engaged in necessary agitation against enhancements of an already excessive land tax; whether the great warlike Sikh community, at their sacred city of Amritsar, recently declared that the sons of the Sikh soldiers who saved the British Empire in India in the days of the Mutiny, are now being ruined by excessive taxation; and whether such taxation already amounts to 65 per cent. of the net profits of their farms.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have no official information as to the arrest of five Lahore barristers, but it is the fact that three pleaders were arrested at Rawalpindi and that bail was refused. They will be tried by the ordinary courts, and, pending the result of the proceedings I cannot make any statement regarding them. Lala Rajpat Rai has not been arrested for any legitimate agitation against any reasonable grievance, but for the active promotion of open sedition. I am not aware that the Sikhs have made any such declaration. But I am aware that it has been suggested to what the hon. Member truly calls this great warlike community, by those who are making it their business to foment disturbances, that they saved India in the Mutiny, that we are now ill-treating them, and that this is a judgment on them for betraying their country in her war of independence. The present assessment of land revenue and cesses together in the Punjab is, according to my information, less than 45 per cent. of the net assets, 50 per cent. being the ordinary standard of assessment of land revenue alone throughout India. I have asked the Government of India for information regarding the alleged recent enhancement.

### Renewal of Licensing (Ireland) Act, 1902.

Mr. HUGH BARRIE (Londonderry, N.); To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is the intention of the Government to renew the Licensing (Ireland) Act, 1902, which expires this year.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Yes, sir.

### Irish Church Temporalities Fund Surplus.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if his attention has been directed to the statement on page 10 of the Report of the Irish Land Commission (31st March, 1905, to 31st March, 1906), that the surplus income of the Irish Temporalities Fund has, by arrangement with the National Debt Commissioners, been utilised in the payment of debt; will he say what debt the surplus has been utilised to pay; under what authority has the surplus of this Irish fund been so applied; and in what way is Ireland benefited by this application.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The surplus income of the Irish Church Temporalities Fund is applied from time to time, as it accrues, in paying off capital charges on that fund. These liabilities, which are secured by bonds guaranteed by the Treasury, are in respect of loans raised for the purposes of the Irish Church Act, 1869, and for other purposes imposed on the fund by various statutory enactments, and repayment of the bonds is accepted by the National Debt Commissioners as the money in the Irish Church Temporalities Fund permits.

### Sale of Estate of Lady Grace at Monard.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that negotiations for sale and purchase as between the landlady, Lady Grace, and her tenants on the townlands of Monard, and those adjoining in the electoral division of Ballykisteen, county Tipperary, have been entered into; can he say whether the agreements have as yet been lodged with the Estates Commissioners; is he aware that threats of raising rents on the non-judicial tenants, and of the exaction of old arrears with others of them by attorneys' letters and processes have been used in inducing some of the tenants to purchase at high prices; is he aware that tenants holding farms whose valuations jointly constitute more than one-fourth of that of the whole estate have refused to purchase; and, under all those considerations, will the Estates Commissioners declare the estate to be a separate estate for sale.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Agreements for the purchase of fifty-five holdings on this estate were lodged with the Estates Commissioners in the early part of this year. The Commissioners have no knowledge that any threats were used in order to induce tenants to purchase. It is the fact that purchase agreements in respect of some of the holdings on the estate have not been lodged. The Commissioners will, when dealing with the estate, fully consider all the facts of the case, including the circumstances alleged in the Question.

### The Mountshannon Estate, County Limerick.

MR. LUNDON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he can say how matters stand on the Mountshannon estate, in the county Limerick; has it yet been divided; if so, have portions of it been allotted to Mrs. Hanora Londregan, of Toolmaine, parish of Doon, James Conway, of Gurtavalla, Doon, Simon Ryan, of Cross, Pallasgrean, and Ellen Rafferty, of Knockroe, Kilteely, all in the county Limerick, and all evicted tenants on whose farms are planters, and who applied for portions of this Mountshannon estate in lieu of their farms as far back as two years ago; and will he communicate with the Estates Commissioners so as to bring about this result.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have settled the scheme for the distribution of the land on this estate. The names of the two persons first mentioned in the Question have been included in the scheme, but not the names of the other two.

### Evicted Tenants in County Kilkenny.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he will grant a Return of the number of tenants evicted from their holdings in county Kilkenny, according to State Returns issued in 1903; how many applications for reinstatement have been lodged up to 1st of May, 1907; the names and addresses of those who have been rejected under regulations of 13th of February, 1906; is he aware that a number have been debarred from lodging applications by reason of want of particulars which can be obtained only by examination of police Returns of evictions within the statutory term; and will he grant such facilities as will enable those tenants or their friends to lodge applications in due course.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Return to which the hon. Member refers shows the number of tenants evicted in the past twenty-five years in county Kilkenny, as well as in every other county in Ireland. All persons who were evicted within the twenty-five years preceding the Act of 1903, or who claim to be the representatives of such evicted tenants, may, if they think fit, send in applications for reinstatement. A very large number of applications has been received, and it would not seem that facilities for lodging applications are in any wise lacking. As I have already stated, I hope after the end of this month to make a detailed statement as to the result of the Estates Commissioners' investigation into evicted tenants' application.

### The Proposed Irish Council—Annual Grant.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if the sum of £236,000, which it is proposed to grant to the Irish Council annually for expenses, will be in whole or in part saved on the expenses of the department which at present does the work proposed to be delegated to the Irish Council, or will such sum be an additional annual charge on the revenue.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) This sum will be an additional annual charge.

### Civil Rights of Irish School Teachers.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he has yet arranged the question of the civil rights of national school teachers in Ireland, and what is the result; and whether, having regard to the nature of the proposals in his Irish Council Bill dealing with education, teachers will be free to discuss them without interference.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In pursuance of the intention which I expressed in this House some time since, I communicated with the Commissioners of National Education upon the subject of their rules relating to the civil rights of teachers. The Commissioners have since informed me that, having fully considered the matter, they cannot see their way to modify the rules. The rule to which I chiefly referred was that which prohibits teachers from attending at political meetings and from taking part in elections for Members of Parliament or Poor Law guardians except by voting. The Commissioners inform me that these restrictions are designed for the real advantage of the teachers and their schools. The general abstention of the teachers from local political quarrels has, the Commissioners claim, added materially to their usefulness, and the Commissioners are strongly of opinion that if a teacher should act as a partisan in a contested election he would incur great personal odium and the result would be most injurious to his school. Under the present system the responsibility in this matter rests entirely with the Commissioners, and I do not, therefore, propose to take any further steps in it. I have referred the latter part of the Question to the Commissioners, and am informed that they will consider it at their meeting to-morrow.

### Moonlighting Disturbances in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that on 23rd March, at Scariff, on the borders of Clare and Galway, the house of a farmer named John Carroll was fired into; that on 13th March shots were fired into the house of a man named Tierney, near Athenry; that on 17th March shots were fired into Colmanstown House; that on 21st March a farmer named Michael O'Connor was fired at from behind a wall and wounded; that on 24th April the house of a farmer named Forde, residing near Brosna, county Kerry, was attacked by moonlighters; that Frank M'Auliffe was wounded in the shoulder by a gunshot in the Kilbogin district; whether, in any of these cases, prosecutions have been undertaken; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Government have received police Reports upon the cases referred to, which show the facts to be substantially as stated in the Question. Three persons were arrested for the offence of firing into the house of John Carroll, but were discharged for want of evidence. One person has been returned for trial at assizes upon the charge of firing at and wounding Frank M'Auliffe. In the remaining cases the police did not succeed in bringing offenders to justice.

### Woolwich Inquiry Committee—German Procedure.

MR. BELLAIRS: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether the present Committee of Inquiry into Woolwich will have evidence submitted to them concerning the manufacture of war material in Germany, where almost the entire orders go to private establishments.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The conference referred to is to consider whether any articles not now made in the Ordnance Factories can be appropriately made there with the existing machinery. The consideration of the manufacture of war material in Germany would not fall within that reference.

### Inspection of Irish Harbours.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, if he will give the names of the harbours on the Irish coast which have been inspected by the Board of Works with a view to their improvement.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) It does not form part of the duties of the Board of Works to inspect harbours generally on the coast of Ireland with a view to their improvement. But the Board have occasionally, at the request of the Irish Government, made Reports on proposals for improvements. If the hon. Member desires any further information as to these cases, perhaps he will put a Question to the Chief Secretary.

### Preservation of Irish Ancient Monuments.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury to state the number of the ancient monuments in Ireland and their names vested in the Board of Works since the passing of the Purchase Act of 1903; whether any arrangements have been made between the Board of Works and the Estates Commissioners for dealing with the question of the preservation of ancient monuments in Ireland; whether the Hill of Tara or any part of it has been vested in the Board of Works; what ancient monuments have been repaired by the Board of Works within the past twelve months; and whether any steps have been taken by the Board for the protection of those monuments vested in them from injury.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) 1. The monuments vested in the Board since the passing of the Purchase Act, 1903, are—

Grianan of Aileach, county Donegal.
Creevalea Abbey, county Leitrim.
St. Mary's Church, county Wicklow.
Kill o' the Grange Church, county Dublin.
Inishkeen Round Tower, county Monaghan.
Grey Abbey, county Down.

The Board have agreed to accept the guardianship of the following, but they are not yet vested—

Callan Abbey, county Kilkenny.
Ballyboggan Abbey, county Meath.
†St. Mary's Church, Gowran, county Kilkenny.
†Roscommon Abbey.

Of these ten monuments two, Callan Abbey, county Kilkenny, and Ballyboggan Abbey, were offered by the Estates Commissioners and the remainder by private owners.

2. In accordance with the terms of the Act the Estates Cmmissioners communicate to the Board of Works the name and position of all ancient monuments situated on estates being sold under the Act, and the Board, after investigation, inform the Estates Commissioners in each case whether the character and condition of the monument justify the Board in assuming responsibility for its care and maintenance.

3. The Answer is in the negative. The earthworks on the Hill of Tara were scheduled to the Ancient Monument Protection Act of 1882, giving the Board power to protect them from injury by any person except the owners. So far the owners have declined to constitute the Board guardians of these earthworks.

---

† Subject to arrangements being made for control of burials.

4. The following monuments have been repaired by the Board during the year ended 31st March, 1907:—

Ancient Monuments.

- Askeaton Abbey.
- Bective Abbey.
- Dingle Promontory.
- Dowth Moat and New Grange.
- Duleek Church.
- Duleek Priory.
- French Church, Waterford.
- Kells Priory.
- Mellifont Abbey.
- Rathmichael Church.
- Slane Abbey.
- Sherkin Island.
- Staigue Fort.
- Termonfeckin Castle.

National Monuments.

- Ardfert Cathedral.
- Glendalough.
- Loughinisland Churches.
- Timoleague Abbey.
- Killiney Church.
- Skreen Church.
- St. Mary's Church, Delgany.
- Clonmacnoise.
- Dysert Church.
- Roscrea Tower and Church.
- Donaghmore Church.
- Fossy or Timahoe Church and Tower.
- Arran Islands Ruins.
- Inishmurray.
- Fenagh Church.
- Ratlass Church.
- Holycross Monastery.
- Maghera Crosses.
- Kilclispeen Crosses.
- Kilree Church and Tower.
- Jerpoint Abbey.
- Killeshin Church.
- Killery Church.
- Clones Tower and Abbey.
- St. Audoen's Church.
- St. Francis Abbey, Kilkenny.
- Killamery Stone Cross.

5. The amount expended by the Board on the protection and maintenance of ancient monuments during the year ended 31st March, 1907, has been:—

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| (*a*) From Voted Moneys - | 510 | 18 | 6 |
| (*b*) National Monuments Fund - - - | 593 | 19 | 5 |
| | 1,104 | 17 | 11 |

The preservation of these monuments is one of the duties of the Board's technical staff and is under the particular direction of one of their principal surveyors who has special qualifications. Every monument in the Board's charge is inspected as far as possible at least once in each year, and a Report sent to the Board as to its condition. Further, at the more important monuments there are resident caretakers.

### Loss on Irish Land Purchase—Relief of Burden on Ratepayers.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can hold out any hope that the net sum of £184,595 lost in connection with land purchase in Ireland, and deducted from the usual grants to local bodies, will, on further consideration, be paid to those bodies in order to avoid the necessity for immediately placing this additional burden upon the ratepayers, many of whom are not parties to the transactions; and can be undertake that no deduction of this nature will be made in respect of the current financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The sum in question was charged on the Guarantee Fund in accordance with the terms of The Irish Land Act, 1903. It is not the case, however, that the whole sum has been deducted from the grants to local authorities. The total sum of £184,595 includes £116,308 in respect of charges for excess stock, which has been defrayed from the Ireland Development Grant. I am not in a position to make any statement as to the future.

### West Ham Workhouse Infirmary, Average Weekly Cost and Cost of Alcoholic Liquors.

Mr. C. NICHOLSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the average total weekly cost, and the average weekly cost per inmate, of the alcoholic liquors consumed in the workhouse and infirmary of the West Ham Union respectively in each of the three years ending March, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have made inquiry on this subject and find that the figures are as follows:—

Workhouse.

| Year ended March | Total cost for year. | Total average weekly cost. | Average weekly cost per inmate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | d. |
| 1905 . . . | 259 0 1¾ | 5 1 4 | ·625 |
| 1906 . . . | 76 2 4½ | 1 5 1 | ·125 |
| 1907 . . . | 9 14 5 | 3 9 | ·02 |

Infirmary.

| Year ended March | Total cost for year. | Total average weekly cost. | Average weekly cost per inmate. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | d. |
| 1905 . . . | 638 7 0¼ | 12 5 6¼ | 5·1 |
| 1906 . . . | 223 15 5¼ | 4 5 1¾ | 1·6 |
| 1907 . . . | 92 4 0½ | 1 15 5½ | ·625 |

### Postal Facilities between Enniskillen and Tempo.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is yet in a position to state the result of his inquiries as to postal facilities between Enniskillen and Tempo, upon which he called for a report, and the result of inquiries as to affording modern facilities at Mulrany and Achill Sound.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I furnished the hon. Member with the information he requires a day or two ago.

### Postal Facilities at Brackey, County Tyrone.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that a post office at Brackey, county Tyrone, has recently been closed; is he aware that inconvenience has been caused to those residing in the district; why was this post office closed; and, seeing that the present post office is located in a cotter's house, will he have the whole matter reconsidered in the interests of the public convenience.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The late sub-postmistress of Brackey resigned in November last, and a successor, whose premises are quite close to the old office, was immediately employed to carry on the work, and has since been appointed. I am informed that the position of the existing office is convenient for the locality which the office is intended to serve.

### Telegraph Office for Garrison, County Fermanagh.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has favourably considered the request for the establishment of a telegraph office at Garrison, county Fermanagh.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am prepared to extend the telegraph system to Garrison under the usual guarantee, the terms of which I am communicating to the hon. Member by letter.

### Cavan Train Services.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has received a resolution from the Cavan County Council asking for a better train service by the Midland Great Western Railway Company of Ireland from Cavan, in view of the desirability of some change, both of passenger and mail service, if the Cavan end of this line is not to be left behind the times entirely; and will he give the matter his consideration, and, if necessary, confer with the Postmaster-General as to the improvement of the mail service, particularly in the direction of supplying a later despatch for English letters.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The hon. Member has sent me a copy of this resolution. The railway company inform me that the traffic of the district does not, in their opinion, warrant more than the existing service of three trains daily in each direction. The question of improvements in connection with the mail service is a matter for my right hon. friend the Postmaster-General, to whom I have transmitted a copy of the resolution.

### Court of Criminal Appeal—Cost and Amount of Business.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the probable cost of establishing the proposed Court of Criminal Appeal; and whether any estimate of the number of cases likely to come before that Court has been made.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) No trustworthy estimate can be made of the number of cases that is likely to come before the proposed Court of Criminal Appeal, and consequently it is impossible to calculate the probable cost of the new Court.

### The Prerogative of Mercy.

MR. AKERS-DOUGLAS (Kent, St. Augustine's): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in respect of the exercise of the prerogative of mercy in indictable cases, how many petitions were sent in to the Home Office in 1905 from or on behalf of persons convicted on indictment and in respect to what number of cases; in how many cases were complaints made of wrong convictions; in how many cases were complaints made of undue severity of the sentence; and in how many cases was the first petition sent in within three months of the conviction.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The following table gives the information asked for by the right hon. Member:—

Petitions received in the Home Office in 1905 in respect of the Conviction or Sentences of Persons tried on indictment.

| Number of Petitions. | Number of Cases. | From whom the Petitions were received. | | | | Whether Petition related to Conviction or to Sentence. | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | From Prisoners. | | From Solicitors, Friends, etc. | | Conviction. | | Sentence. | |
| | | Petitions. | Cases. | Petitions. | Cases. | Petitions. | Cases. | Petitions. | Cases. |
| 2,199 | 1,499 | 1,713 | 1,242 | 486 | 283 | 1,013 | 674 | 1,186 | 850 |

The term "petition" includes all applications on behalf of prisoners, however informal. The total number of petitions in indictable cases was 3,145, but 946 related to questions of prison treatment, conditions of release, etc., and are not included above. In 614 of the 1,499 cases the first petition was received within three months of the date when sentence was passed. Petitions which raised questions both as to the conviction and sentence are counted under the head "Conviction."

### New Budget Proposal—Postponement of Quinquennial Re-Valuation.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has considered that a great amount of extra assistance will be required in income tax districts, considering that the extra work arising from the new Budget will commence at the same time as the heavy work entailed by the quinquennial re-valuation year in 1908; and will he state what steps he proposes to take.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) Yes, sir. The point has not escaped my attention, and, in view of the strain to which the officials will be subjected in initiating the new arrangements, I have decided to propose the postponement of the re-valuation due in 1908 for one year.

### The Post Office Savings Bank.

MR. WALROND (Devonshire, Tiverton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will so alter the method of calculating the interest allowed to depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank as to prevent the expenditure of that bank exceeding the income; whether he is aware that the expenditure of the bank exceeded the income for the year 1903 by £107,403, for the year 1904 by £112,090, and for the year 1905 by £88,094; whether he would consider the suggestion that this annual deficiency might be turned into a surplus of over £100,000 per annum if the rule as to interest was so altered as to allow 2½ per cent. only on sums left in the bank for a complete calendar year, but sums left in the bank for a period of one or more complete months less than a year to receive 2 per cent.; and, if he is not prepared to consider a preferential difference of a half per cent. in the rates of interest, according to the stability of deposit, will he consider a preferential difference of a quarter per cent. with the view of making the Post Office Savings Bank pay its way.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith*). The Select Committee of 1902 on the Savings Bank's Funds recommended a reduction in the rate of interest allowed to depositors with a view to balancing the income accounts of the funds. The question was discussed in this House on 15th March, 1904, and the general opinion was then clearly against such a reduction. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer on that occasion expressed his hopes that, owing to the rise in the prevailing rate of interest which had taken place since the date of the Committee's inquiry, it might be possible in the course of a few years to reduce very considerably the deficiency of income without altering the rate paid to depositors. Monetary conditions have not in the meantime altered in such a way as to weaken that expectation, and I see no reason to depart from the decision then adopted.

MR. WALROND: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will have a Return prepared for the Post Office Savings Bank showing the amount of money contained in excess of the £200 limit by those balances which have exceeded that limit by accumulations of interest, and on which excess no interest is paid to depositors, with the object of keeping such excess in actual gold as a small gold reserve for the Savings Bank.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith*). The aggregate of the amounts in excess of £200 is considerably increased on 1st January in each year by the crediting of the interest which has accrued during the preceding year. It diminishes throughout the year owing to withdrawals from the accounts, and in December it is reduced to a comparatively small sum. It is estimated that the average sum of which the Savings Bank thus has the use, without paying interest upon it, is approximately £240,000, representing at 2½ per cent. a saving of about £6,000 per annum in interest paid. I do not think that the suggested application of this sum to the purposes of a gold reserve would be practicable.

MR. WALROND: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider the advisability of, without any expense, providing a reasonable gold reserve for the Savings Bank funds, and, at the same time, meeting the wishes of a large number of depositors by extending the present statutory maximum limit of deposit, namely £200, stipulating that the excess of money over £200 should bear no interest whatever and should be kept as a gold reserve.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I am not prepared to recommend an extension of the maximum limit of deposit, nor am I aware of any general desire for the opportunity of depositing money in the Savings Banks without interest.

### Differentiated Income-Tax—Rearrangement of Surveyors Staff.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, considering the increase of work that will ensue in carrying out the provisions of a differentiated income-tax, and in the examination of confidential returns now made compulsory, he proposes to abolish the present system of clerk hire, and to substitute established clerks, called tax clerks, having a special entrance examination.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The question of the re-arrangements of staff required in connection with the new proposals will be considered in due course, but, as at present advised, I do not think any such far-reaching alteration in its character will be necessary.

### Retirement of Indian Police Officers.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is intended to carry out the recommendation of the Indian Police Commission, and to allow officers to retire on a pension after twenty-five years service without the production of a medical certificate.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I understand that the matter is still under consideration of the Government of India, who have not addressed me in regard to it.

### Untenanted Lands in the Mullingar and Delvin Districts.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will give the names of the townlands in the Mullingar and Delvin rural districts, in which untenanted land is situated, for the inspection of which the Estates Commissioners have obtained the owner's consent, with the area of such land in each townland, as ascertained from the ordnance maps.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Answer which I gave on 12th March, to his former Question on the subject of untenanted land in Westmeath.† The Estates Commissioners are not in a position to add anything to that Answer at present.

### Vesting of Irish Court Houses in the County Councils.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government will consider the propriety of vesting the court houses in Ireland in the county councils, who are the representatives of the ratepayers, so as to prevent the refusal of the buildings for purposes common to all creeds and parties when not required for legal purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The change which my hon. friend suggests could only be effected by legislation. The matter would require very careful consideration, and I do not think that the Government could undertake to consider it at present.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Publication of Report of Estates Commissioners Prior to Introduction of Bill.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now fix the date upon which he will introduce his Bill relating to evicted tenants in Ireland; and will the annual Report of the Estates Commissioners, or a special Report relating to evicted tenants, be available to Members of this House before that date.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 1405.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have already stated that I hope after the end of this month to make a detailed statement as to the result of the Estates Commissioners' inquiries into the cases of evicted tenants. The Commissioners will make a special Report on the subject, and this will be ready by the middle of June. The decision as to further legislation in regard to evicted tenants will depend upon the facts as shown by the Commissioners' Report.

### Application of Glennamaddy Board of Guardians for Grant in Relief of Distress.

MR. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board has reconsidered the application of the Glennamaddy Board of Guardians for a grant in relief of the distress in that union; and whether the Board intend to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have fully considered the application referred to, and are satisfied that no destitution exists in the Glennamaddy Union which cannot be provided for under the ordinary law.

### Purchase of the Estate of C. D. O'Rorke of Cloonberren.

MR. HAZELTON: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Land Judge has yet come to any decision with reference to the amended offer of the Estates Commissioners, transmitted to him on 27th April for the purchase of the estate of Charles D. O'Rorke, Cloonberren, Kilbannon, county Galway; and, if so, what decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed by the Registrar of the Land Judge's Court that the Estates Commissioners' amended offer is still under consideration by the parties interested in the estate, and has therefore not yet been considered by the Land Judge.

### Surcharge on Members of Cavan County Council.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has received a resolution, proposed by P. McManus, C.C., seconded by James Harman, C.C., and adopted by the Cavan County Council, asking that the Local Government Board remit a surcharge of £74 15s. 2d. made upon four members of the joint asylum committee of Monaghan and Cavan in connection with the maintenance, etc., of one Francis McDonald; and, in view of the circumstances connected with this transaction, will he look into the whole matter and advise that this surcharge be remitted.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have received the resolution. The surcharge referred to was confirmed by the Local Government Board and the amount has since been lodged to the credit of the asylum committee. I find that my predecessor fully considered the case and decided, with all the facts before him, that it could not be re-opened. I do not, therefore, propose to take any further steps.

### Evicted Tenants on the Estate of Captain Singleton.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether negotiations have been in progress between Captain Singleton, owner of the townland of Belpatrick, county Louth, and the Estates Commissioners for the sale of two farms in order that two evicted tenants might be restored thereon; whether the delay which has taken place has prevented Captain Singleton from making grazing holdings of the lands; and if he will arrange that the sale of this small property shall be promptly carried out, in the interests alike of the evicted tenants and the landlord.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that this matter is under consideration. The owner has lodged an originating request in respect of the property, and the Commissioners will make a formal offer for purchase as soon as the necessary preliminaries have been completed.

### Royal Irish Constabulary—Men Invalided through Injuries Received on Duty.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of men of the Royal Irish Constabulary who have been invalided during last year from injuries received in discharge of their duties.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It is assumed that the Question is intended to refer to men who were invalided from injuries received from assaults or violence while in the discharge of their duties. During the year 1906 there were two such cases in which men were permanently invalided and discharged on pension. In one other case a constable is under medical treatment, and it has not yet been ascertained whether the injury will be permanent. In seventy-eight cases men were temporarily invalided, many of them for short periods. I may add that the number of men invalided from injuries accidentally received was 165. In eight of these cases the injury was permanent, and the men were discharged on pension. The remaining 157 men were temporarily invalided.

### Destruction of Irish Timber—Suggested Forestry Department.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a communication from the Irish Forestry Society, calling attention to the great destruction of timber in Ireland and urging the creation of a forestry department similar to those of most Continental countries and of India; and whether he can see his way to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I understand that the proposal referred to in the Question has come before both the Royal Commission on Congestion in Ireland and the Committee of Inquiry into the Department of Agriculture. It would seem desirable to await the Reports of both of these bodies before further considering the matter.

### Irish Constabulary Force Fund.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the growing feeling of dissatisfaction which exists amongst the pensioners of the Royal Irish Constabulary in regard to the condition of the Constabulary Force Fund; and whether he is prepared to receive a deputation from the Constabulary Pensioners' Association, in order that they might explain fully the justice of their claim to have the fund wound up.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I beg to refer to the Answer which I gave to the hon. Member's Question on this subject on the 9th instant.† I have since written to the Constabulary Pensioners' Association explaining at length the reason why no more summary method of winding up this fund can be adopted than that of meeting its obligations to widows and orphans of subscribers as they arise, and expressing my inability to accede to their request that I should receive a deputation on the subject.

### Applications for Position of County Surveyor in Meath and East Galway.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether applications for the position of county surveyor in Meath and Galway East are to be sent in the first instance to the Local Government Board or to the county councils.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In each of these cases the county council gave directions that applications for the position of county surveyor should be sent in the first instance to the county council.

### Chairmanship of Irish Petty Sessions Courts.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether there is any regulation dealing with the constitution of a court of petty sessions in Ireland as to who should take the chair during the sittings of the court; and is the resident magistrate, if present, entitled as of right to preside.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer to both parts of the Question is in the negative. If the hon. Member will refer to the Answer which I gave on April 18th to the Question put by the hon. Member for Mid Cork he will find a full statement on the matter.‡

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 348.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1112.

### Delay in Reinstatement of Mr. John O'Brien of Aughamuldoney.

Mr. DOLAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the cause of the delay in reinstating Mr. John O'Brien, Aughamuldoney, county Fermanagh, to the holding from which he was evicted on the estate of Mr. James Johnston, D.L., Kinlough, county Leitrim, the farm having been inspected by the Estates Commissioners on 24th January, 1907, and the agent having informed Mr. O'Brien that the Estates Commissioners had bought the farm at £155.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners have considered their inspector's report on this case, and have now informed the owner of the price which they are prepared to give for the holding, with the object of reinstating O'Brien, provided that he should sign an agreement to purchase at that price.

### Purchase of Estate of Mrs. Acheson at Derwana.

Mr. DOLAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it has been brought to the notice of the Estates Commissioners that the agent on the estate of Mrs. Acheson, situate at Derwana, barony of Dromahair, county Leitrim, having offered twenty and a half years' purchase and half a year's rent as terms of sale, subsequently withdrew his offer and issued processes against the tenants; and will the Estates Commissioners consider the advisability of intervening.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have, in pursuance of the Lord-Lieutenant's regulations, offered their services as conciliators in this case, but have not yet heard whether the owner is willing that they should intervene in the matter.

### Purchase of Grazing Land at Mevoo, Ballycorry.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the grazing lands at Mevoo, Ballycorry, North Kerry, which are situate in a congested district, have been offered for sale by the landlord, E. M. Stock, Esq., to the Congested Districts Board for division amongst the poor people of the district; and, if so, what action has the Congested Districts Board taken in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The lands in question have not been offered for sale to the Congested Districts Board. If the property should be offered to the Board, the question of purchasing it will be considered.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of J. Faley, of Listowel.

Mr. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Jeremiah Faley, of Listowel, who was evicted from a farm of land on the G. R. Browne estate at Diriah, near Listowel, North Kerry; and what action have the Estates Commissioners taken in the matter for the reinstatement of Faley.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into this case and have decided that it is not one in which they can take action.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of William Hennessy, of Listowel.

Mr. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an application has been made by William Hennessy, of Listowel, son of Michael Hennessy, who was evicted about twenty-six years ago by G. R. Browne, at Dromerin, Listowel; and whether any action has been taken for his reinstatement.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners received the application in question on 19th January last, and referred it to their inspector, whose report has not yet been received.

### Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Prime Minister whether the Government will give facilities for the Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill as a non-contentious temperance measure, which, when introduced in a former session by the hon. Member for South Tyrone, passed through all stages in the House of Commons.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) I am afraid that at this period of the session no promise of facilities can be given.

### The Colonial Conference and Ireland.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: To ask the Prime Minister whether any representations have been made to him or to Lord Elgin dealing with the propriety of having the views of the Colonial Conference, now sitting in London, collected on the question of Home Rule for Ireland; and will he bring before the Conference the objectionableness of payment of percentages to emigration agents in Ireland by the Colonies where this practice at present prevails.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) The answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. With regard to the second part of the Question, I am informed that the time at the disposal of the Conference does not admit of a return to the question of emigration on which there has already been a full discussion.

### The Hague Conference and Mining Operations in Territorial Waters.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the casualties and danger to neutral shipping from mines floating on the high seas, both before and after the cessation of hostilities in the Russo-Japanese War, instructions will be given to the British representatives at the Hague Conference to raise the question, with a view to limiting mining operations to territorial waters.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) The British plenipotentiaries will be duly furnished with instructions on this point.

### The Royal College of Surgeons.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Prime Minister whether he has now considered the memorial presented to him last session on behalf of the members of the Royal College of Surgeons of England, asking him to take such steps as might secure to members some voice in the management of the College and its property; whether any representations have been made by the Privy Council to the College of Surgeons and with what result; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House copies of any communications which have passed.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) The memorial mentioned in the Question was transmitted to the council of the college by the Lord President, and, subsequently to the receipt of their observations thereon, Lord Crewe saw a deputation from the society of members. The society have since furnished a rejoinder to the observations of the council, which has been forwarded to that body with an intimation that the Lord President is willing to receive a deputation from them in due course.

### Religion of Irish Land Commission.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the names of Land Commissioners and Sub-Commissioners now serving in Ireland; and whether there is any official record of the religious denominations to which they belong.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I would refer the hon. Member to Parliamentary Paper, No. 231, of last session, which contains a list of the Judicial and other Commissioners, and of the Legal and Lay assistant Commissioners and Assessors then in office. That list still holds good subject to the following alterations—

> *Judicial Commissioners:* Mr. Justice J. O. Wylie has replaced Mr. Justice R. E. Meredith.
>
> *Legal Assistant Commissioners:* Mr. J. H. Edge has retired.
>
> *Lay Assistant Commissioners:* Messrs. J. Clarke, L. Croasdaile, R. Donovan, T. L. Esmonde, and P. H. Grierson are no longer serving; Messrs. M. Flanagan, J. Gill, J. J. Howard, P. Lafferty, T. Linehan, J. D. Beckett, A. Bestall, R. Coll, P. F. Mullally, and W. Small have since been appointed.

There is no official record of the religious opinions of the Commissioners.

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Australasia and the Navy.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether an understanding has been arrived at with the Australian representatives to the Imperial Conference that the agreement under which Australia and New Zealand pay £240,000 a year towards the upkeep of an Imperial naval squadron in Australasian waters should be determined before 1910.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the question of general contribution to the Imperial Navy has been considered at the present Colonial Conference; and if the arrangement entered into in 1902 with the Governments of the Australian Commonwealth and New Zealand, by which the Australian Squadron is confined within specified waters, is considered satisfactory by the Admiralty.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The general question of Colonial contributions and the Australasian agreement were both discussed at the Conference, and Papers giving a report of the discussion will shortly be published. No action can be taken until the Colonial Prime Ministers have laid before their several Parliaments the proposals discussed between them and the Admiralty, and have obtained their consent to any proposed changes. Unless changes are agreed to, the Agreement of 1902 holds good till 1910.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Is it the case that the Australian Government desire to withdraw their contribution to the Admiralty and apply it to local defence?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I can make no statement on that subject at the present time.

### Lyddite Shell Tenders.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the lowest and average private tenders for lyddite shell and also the Woolwich tender; whether in response to War Office requests orders have been diverted to Woolwich; and, if so, for what reason.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It has not been the custom of the Admiralty, or, so far as I know, of any public department, to make known the amounts of recent tenders. No orders for lyddite have been diverted from the private trade to Woolwich. But I ought to say that, having regard to the exceptional situation, the proportion of orders for ordnance stores to be allocated to Woolwich will be somewhat in excess of the normal.

### Naval Contracts.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, what are the articles ordered by the Admiralty for the British Navy in the case of contracts executed for the Works Department for which the contractors are not bound to use British materials; whether contractors for other things, other than those executed for the Works Department, are allowed to sub-let their contracts; and, if so, what conditions are made to prevent the sub-contractors from using anything except British material manufactured by British workmen.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: In the case of Works Department contracts, that is for building materials, it has long been the practice to specify the standard of quality only without reference to the place of origin or manufacture. Contracts may not be sublet without Admiralty sanction, which is only given in exceptional cases. In large contracts for machinery, etc., specialities may be obtained from sub-contractors subject to the Admiralty approval in each case. All work is done under Admiralty inspection, and the same conditions apply to the subcontractor as to the main contractor. There is no restriction on the source of the material used, which must be the best obtainable.

### Lance-Corporals.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether lance-corporals will be appointed in the Territorial Army or not.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddingtonshire): No decision on this point has yet been reached.

MR. ASHLEY: I will repeat the Question later.

### Soldiers' Walking-Out Uniform.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it has yet been decided whether a walking-out uniform for the territorial soldier is to be provided at the public cost or not.

MR. HALDANE: It is contemplated to take money in the Estimates for the provision of a walking-out dress for the territorial soldier.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): What additional sum will it add to the Estimate?

MR. HALDANE: I cannot say.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Has no calculation been made?

MR. HALDANE: Yes.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Then surely the right hon. Gentleman can say how it will affect the Estimate.

### Soldiers' Kit.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the territorial soldier, on joining, will receive a free issue of underclothing and necessaries; and on whom the annual cost of maintenance of these articles will fall.

MR. HALDANE: The whole question is under consideration.

MR. ASHLEY: I will repeat the Question.

### Rifles for Rifle Clubs.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will issue to affiliated rifle clubs free of charge those Lee-Metford and Lee-Enfield rifles recently withdrawn from the Regular troops, which may be found on examination to be unsuitable for conversion and re-issue to such troops, in order that they may be used by these clubs with a Morris or other tube on miniature ranges.

MR. HALDANE: No rifles withdrawn from troops are at present available for the purpose mentioned. Later on unserviceable long rifles may be available, and it may then be considered whether they should not be issued at the usual price of 1s. 6d. each.

MR. CARLILE: Cannot they be issued free of charge so as to encourage rifle practice?

MR. HALDANE: No decision has yet been come to.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): Will the right hon. Gentleman define "later on?"

MR. HALDANE: Until the very complicated questions connected with this subject have all been carefully considered I can make no statement.

### Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers Militia Staff.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when it is proposed to issue the new pattern walking-out caps and putties to the permanent staff of the Militia; is he aware that they have been issued to the line battalions of the Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers, while the Militia staff of the same regiment are wearing a composite uniform in part consisting of the old caps and leggings.

MR. HALDANE: The permanent staff of Militia battalions will be supplied with the new pattern walking-out cap as soon as the line battalions of their regiment have received it. The officers commanding the Militia battalions of the Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers have been called upon to submit size rolls for their permanent staff, and caps are now in course of issue to two battalions. Putties are being issued to the Militia as the stock of leggings becomes exhausted.

### Woolwich Arsenal and Emigration.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in every case where workmen have received notice of dismissal at Woolwich Arsenal, the notice has been accompanied with official directions and advice to the discharged workman to emigrate either to foreign countries or the Colonies; will he say whether such advice has been given with the authority of his Department; and what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. HALDANE: Men discharged on reduction are notified that information in regard to the prospects of work, cost of living, etc., in the various British Colonies and foreign countries can be obtained from the Emigrants Information Office, 31, Broadway, Westminster, which is a sub-department of the Colonial Office, The sole object of this notification is to acquaint men desirous of emigration of a reliable source from which they could obtain information, and to prevent their being misled by irresponsible or bogus advertisements.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Has the right hon. Gentleman's attention been called to the huge placard exhibited at Woolwich asking "Why stay here and starve when you can get work in Canada?"

MR. HALDANE. My attention has not been called to that placard.

### Enlistment Regulations.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it will be possible to enlist in the Territorial Army for a particular battalion, regiment, or military body, or whether enlistment will only be permitted for general service under the county association.

MR. HALDANE: The actual enlistment will be in the terms of Clause 8 of the Bill, and may be for a particular arm or unit. The Association will, of course, decide what vacancies there are, but as far as possible men will be enabled to choose their own units, in the same manner as at present prevails in the Militia.

### Transvaal Volunteer Force.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is proposed that a large voluntary force should be organised in the Transvaal; whether this suggestion comprises the raising of a volunteer force of artillery; whether the Transvaal Government have ordered, or propose to order, any reduction to be effected in the cost of the present volunteer forces of that Colony; and whether the Transvaal Government have given or propose to give instructions that any reduction should be made in the South African Constabulary in the Transvaal.

MR. HALDANE: I have no knowledge of the matters referred to. Questions affecting the forces of a self-governing Colony are the immediate concern of the Colonial Office, and this Question should be addressed to my right hon. friend.

### Woolwich Lyddite Shells.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the case of a recent manufacture of lyddite shell by the Government establishment at Woolwich, the number of shell rejected amounted to as much as 90 per cent., and if not, whether he can state the exact percentage; whether he can state the price charged for the shell about to be or being manufactured by Woolwich; and what has been the corresponding price on the part of contractors.

MR. HALDANE: The inspection of lyddite shells manufactured by the Ordnance Factories, Woolwich, is not yet completed and the exact percentage of rejections cannot be stated. The prices cannot at present be given—estimates only are available until manufacture is completed. It is contrary to practice to state the contractors' prices.

MR. BELLAIRS: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman indicate approximately the proportion of shells rejected? Was it anything like that stated in the Question?

MR. HALDANE: I do not think it would be safe to attempt it at present.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the explanation offered by the Woolwich authorities, acting as manufacturers, for passing faulty materials which were utilised in the subsequent manufacture of lyddite shell; whether the authorities are in the habit of thoroughly testing their materials before using them; and whether the Government are adhering to the policy of running the Arsenal on strictly commercial lines.

MR. HALDANE: Some material used for manufacture of lyddite shells has developed flaws which could only be found during manufacture or by cutting up the material. All such material has to be replaced free of charge by the contractors supplying it. Materials used in the Ordnance factories are thoroughly tested and the material now under question passed the prescribed tests. The Woolwich Arsenal is so far as is possible for a Government establishment run on commercial lines.

### Artillery Militia.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, as it is arranged that all Artillery Militia are to become field Artillery, he will take immediate steps to secure to the officers facilities and incentives to train themselves for mounted service at the Government's expense.

MR. HALDANE: It would in present circumstances be premature to take the steps suggested in the Question.

### Conditions of Service in the Territorial Army.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what steps he proposes to take under the Territorial Army Scheme to secure uniformity of conditions for individuals of corps of the Territorial Army who are recruited in different counties and whose members will come under the jurisdiction of different associations.

MR. HALDANE: The conditions of service in the Territorial Force will be uniform so far as concerns the period of embodiment for field training, when the whole force is administered directly by the Military authorities. At other periods, while uniformity of system will be aimed at, it would not be, in the opinion of the Government, desirable to prescribe in advance absolute rigidity of conditions. Circumstances may differ in different counties.

### The Militia.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, similarly to the course pursued with regard to the Yeomanry, he will consider the advisability of postponing the metamorphosis of the Militia for another three years.

MR. HALDANE: Assuming that the hon. and gallant Member is referring to future enlistments for the Yeomanry and Militia, men enlisting up to the time of the transfer of their units to the county associations will remain on conditions existing at the time of their enlistment.

### Gunner Crossan, Fife Volunteer Artillery.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what compensation has been or will be granted to Gunner Crossan, of the Fife Royal Garrison Volunteer Artillery, who met with an accident in the pursuance of his duty on His Majesty's service on 13th April last.

MR. HALDANE: The case is being dealt with by the General Officer Commanding in Chief under the provisions of paragraph 618 Volunteer Regulations. Crossan will receive a gratuity of 3s. 6d. a day for the period, not exceeding 6 months, during which he is prevented from following his civil employment. In the event of his discharge from the corps as a result of the accident he would be eligible for pension under the Royal Warrant.

### Artillery Militia—Mounted Training.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether in consideration of the fact that in Artillery Militia the rank and file have had no opportunity for mounted training, he will take steps to afford it to them, or whether he intends the present personnel to be replenished by another class of recruit.

MR. HALDANE: It will not be possible this year to afford facilities for mounted training to men of Garrison Artillery Militia units not allocated to Coast Defences. A circular will shortly be issued explaining the new terms of service which will be offered to men now serving in the Royal Garrison Artillery Militia.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Am I to take it the Militia Artillery are to be made field artillery?

MR. HALDANE: Yes, that is so.

### Work for Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will explain why Woolwich Arsenal is getting five-sixths of the orders for gun mountings as against two-sixths last year; and whether, in making this allocation, he has taken into consideration the loss of employment to private traders, and the fact that their foreign orders are in large measure dependent on the extent to which they receive orders from the Government.

MR. HALDANE: If the Question refers to naval gun mountings it should be addressed to my right hon. friend. The only land service gun mountings to be made this year are a few siege carriages, and the balance of the field gun carriages allocated to the Ordnance factories in the proportion of one-third as compared with two-thirds to the trade.

MR. CROOKS: Can the right hon. Gentleman endeavour to arrange with the Admiralty to get the amount of work for Woolwich which is mentioned in the Question?

MR. HALDANE: The Admiralty have given me as much as they can. They have their own arrangements with certain private establishments, which they have to keep up for the exigencies of war. The allocation of orders is in the nature of a retainer for that purpose.

MR. BELLAIRS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the allocation of orders to Woolwich has been attributed by the hon. Member for Woolwich to "the way they were worrying the authorities"—that is, to the political pressure brought to bear on the Government?

MR. CROOKS: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will inform the hon. Member for Lynn Regis that there is all the difference in the world between ordinary work and gun mountings?

MR. HALDANE: I am not a postman.

### The Unrest in India.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether in view of the Indian Act allowing the Viceroy of India to seize a subject of the King, to transport him from one province to another, to put him in prison, and to detain him in prison for life without trial, he will say whether any person or persons have been so treated; and, if so, how many; whether any are now in prison, and for what periods; and whether he will have this Act repealed without delay.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for India whether Mr. Lajpatrai, pleader of the Punjab Chief Court, arrested in Lahore and deported to another province, has been so arrested under an old Act which empowers the Viceroy to keep prisoners confined for an unlimited period without trial; whether there are at present in any prison in British India any natives confined and not yet brought to justice who were arrested many years ago under this same Act; and, if so, what are their numbers; and will steps be taken at once to annul the Act in question.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA-(Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The Regulation of 1818 deals with the confinement of State prisoners. The preamble recites that "reasons of State, embracing the due maintenance of the alliances formed by the British with foreign Powers, the preservation of tranquility in the territories of native Princes entitled to its protection, and the security of the British dominions from foreign hostility and from internal commotion, occasionally render it necessary to place under personal restraint individuals against whom there may not be sufficient ground to institute any judicial proceeding, or when such proceeding may not be adapted to the nature of the case, or may for other reasons be inadvisable or improper." Each half-year the Government of India review the cases of persons so detained, and consider whether the detention may be terminated. There are at present thirty-two persons under detention or restraint, most of whom are political *détenus*, such as the ex-Khan of Khelat, the ex-Maharaja of Bharatpur, the persons concerned in the Manipur troubles of 1891, and the ex-Mehtar of Chitral. The number of British subjects detained is small; they are chiefly Moplahs from Malabar. Ten persons are in prison. The regulation is rarely resorted to for the last of the purposes mentioned in the preamble—"the security of the British dominions from internal commotion." The most recent important case of the kind was the detention, after the murders of Mr. Rand and Lieutenant Ayerst, at Poona in 1897, of the Natu brothers in Bombay. I may add that Lajpatrai is to be detained in a fort in the place to which he is being taken, and treated with consideration as a State prisoner pending further instructions. Suitable precautions will be taken to prevent him from communicating with others when such communication might lead to popular disturbance. I am sure that the House will forgive me if I very confidently remind hon. Members that there are no persons so interested in the prompt suppression of disorder, and in taking prompt measures to prevent the spread of disorder, as the Indian Party and the Indian causes with which my hon. friends are in such sympathy. There can be no secret that if disorder spreads there will be an end to all those prospects, whether we like it or not, of reform which the Viceroy and I—and I do not believe that any two servants of the Crown have understood one another better than the Viceroy and I—have hoped, and still hope, to produce. Executive measures of this kind—and I think my Parliamentary record will show anyone that no one dislikes them more than I do—must be judged and tested by the emergency and the risk. Now, suppose it to be possible that the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, nearly the whole of whose active service in India has been spent in the Punjab, believes that he is right in thinking that these agitations lend themselves to promote mischiefs which he regards as being of the gravest and most formidable kind, what should we do? I hope my hon. friends will realise what these mischiefs may mean. They are not mischiefs such as we are familiar with here, or in any other parts of the Empire. They are enormous, and therefore my colleagues and I, representing His Majesty's Government, are determined, when asked whether we are going to repeal or to annul the regulations of 1818, not to strip the Government of India of any weapon which the law places in our hands for the suppression of these dangerous disturbances and disorders.

MR. O'GRADY asked whether, seeing that the agitation was purely a political one, the right hon. Gentleman would see that the gentlemen who had been arrested in the recent disturbance had the opportunity of a fair public trial.

MR. MORLEY: Regarded from my hon. friend's point of view, such a promise would be to unsay all that I have just said. This is a case of emergency and grave risk, and it would be impossible for us, or for any Government, to give up any weapon we may possess.

MR. O'GRADY: May I ask why these same measures were not applied to other sections of the community in certain former cases of disorder? Why not to the Nawab of Deccan, whose action led to rioting, looting, and common robbery?

MR. MORLEY: I must ask for notice of that Question, but I hope my hon. friend will reconsider it.

MR. O'GRADY: I have already put that Question, and the Answers up to the present have been unsatisfactory.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman very respectfully whether he will have prepared for the information of the House a full list of the gentlemen arrested in this way without trial, stating where they are detained, the nature of the treatment they are subjected to, and whether they are allowed to communicate with their friends outside? And can the right hon. Gentleman give any indication of the length of time these gentlemen are likely to be imprisoned, and whether there is any intention now or in the future of bringing them to a trial such as they would get in any other portion of the Empire?

MR. MORLEY: I cannot undertake to say that there is any intention of bringing them to trial, because the difficulties of trial are so great, and we should be practically stultifying ourselves if I made that promise. As for the other Question, my hon. friend knows very well from long experience that if a man is arrested as a political prisoner, I, at all events, will advise the Government of India to be as lenient as the public safety permits.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to give notice that, at the first possible opportunity, I will draw attention to the singular action of the Government in India, and move a Resolution that coercion is just as little likely to succeed in avoiding mischief and in bringing real and permanent peace to India as it has been in Ireland.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I wish to ask whether any of these political prisoners have had their sentences revised, and whether they are now enjoying the freedom which we expect in the British dominions?

MR. MORLEY: If the hon. Member will put that Question on the Paper I will endeavour to give him an Answer.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Is the reason why these men are not to be brought to trial that they have not committed any offence against the law?

Subsequently,

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I do not know whether it would be in the public interest that the Secretary of State for India should make a statement with regard to recent events in India.

MR. MORLEY: I do not think that anything I have to say would be against the public interest. The latest information from the Punjab shows that the measures taken by the Government of India with the full support of His Majesty's Government at home have sufficed for the maintenance of tranquillity. The city and cantonment of Lahore were on Saturday being patrolled by British and native troops and by the police, and no signs of unusual excitement were observed. The Government of India have ordered the prosecution of a newspaper for publishing a pamphlet (a copy of which, found on a Sikh in London, I hold in my hand) inciting the native troops against the Government. That is not a thing which we should wish to condone. As to Eastern Bengal, the situation is strained owing to the great bitterness that prevails between the Hindus and Mahomedans, the cause of which is to be found in the attempts made by Hindu agitators to compel the Mahomedans by open violence to abstain from purchasing foreign goods in the markets and fairs, which are extremely numerous in the middle of April. The consequent disorders have assumed a very serious aspect, and have created a feeling of great unrest both in the province of Eastern Bengal and in Calcutta. Agitation by seditious speeches at public meetings—a form of disseminating sedition much more effective and more immediately dangerous among moderately literate people than agitation through the Press—is prevalent, and it is impossible to suppress it owing to the difficulty of obtaining evidence of speeches delivered in the vernacular. In these circumstances, the Governor-General in Council, with the approval of His Majesty's Government, has promulgated an Ordinance under the Act of 1861 to the following effect:—(1) Public meetings for the discussion of public or political matters shall not be held unless seven days' notice has been given to the superintendent of police. (2) Police officers and others may be deputed to attend meetings for the purpose of reporting speeches—a proviso with which my hon. friends opposite are familiar. (3) The district magistrate may, by order in writing, prohibit a meeting if, in his opinion, it is likely to promote sedition or disturbance of public tranquillity. (4) The persons concerned in the promotion of a meeting held without notice shall be punishable with six months' imprisonment. (5) A prohibited meeting to be deemed an unlawful assembly under the penal code. Under the fourth provision of the Ordinance the police would be bound to bring the accused before a magistrate within twenty-four hours of the arrest. He would be tried in due course of law by a magistrate of the first class or the second class, presumably in such a case by a magistrate of the first class. If convicted, he would have an appeal to the Sessions Judge. If his appeal were dismissed, he could, if his case were in the Punjab, present an application in revision to the Chief Court at Lahore. If his case were in Eastern Bengal his application in revision would be to the High Court at Calcutta. Under the fifth provision of the Ordinance any person who is a member of an unlawful assembly may, on conviction by a magistrate of the first or second class, be punished by imprisonment, which may extend to six months, or with fine or with both. He would have an appeal to the Sessions Judge, and from the Sessions Judge he could apply in revision to the Chief Court at Lahore or to the High Court at Calcutta as the case might be. This Ordinance will be applied to districts that may be proclaimed in the Punjab and in Eastern Bengal and Assam—this measure is considered to be absolutely necessary by the responsible Government in India in the interest of the public safety.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman a Question of which I have given private notice, namely, whether he can make any further statement regarding the causes of the disaffection in the Punjab, and will he also state the steps which it is proposed to take to remove it?

MR. MORLEY: I think the House will agree that these are two Questions the width and breadth of which are so enormous that it is impossible for me to deal with them satisfactorily in Answer to a Question. When the occasion comes I shall certainly be perfectly prepared—

AN HON. MEMBER: When will it come?

MR. MORLEY: It may come earlier, but an opportunity will certainly come, when it will be my duty to introduce the Indian Budget, to discuss the whole situation.

DR. RUTHERFORD: Will the right hon. Gentleman use his influence with the hon. Member for Montgomery Burghs, to induce him to withdraw his blocking Motion, so as to enable the House to discuss this question on the Motion for the adjournment on Wednesday?

MR. MORLEY: It is impossible for me to prevent this Question from being discussed on Wednesday.

DR. RUTHERFORD: But will the right hon. Gentleman use his influence with the hon. Member?

MR. MORLEY: I am afraid I have never taken the measure of that influence.

SIR H. COTTON: I understood the right hon. Gentleman to say last Monday that the causes of dissatisfaction were the assessment of land, the water rates, and forced labour. May I ask if he will cause an inquiry to be made into these matters?

MR. MORLEY: When the time comes for this discussion I shall endeavour to be as well furnished with information as I can on all the grounds.

MR. W. REDMOND: In view of the drastic change which will be brought about in consequence of the ordinance just read to the House, may I ask whether the Government will give an early day to enable the House to discuss the situation, or whether extraordinary alterations of this kind, practically suspending the rights of British citizens in India, are to be carried out without this House having an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon them?

MR. MORLEY: I doubt very much—I speak quite frankly, and hon. Members will not suspect me of disrespect for Parliamentary discussion—whether at this moment it is particularly desirable that those in India, whom I am not criticising, but who are apparently pursuing courses of agitation which are very undesirable, should have it in their power to say that this House is divided.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: We are not.

MR. W. REDMOND: We are.

MR. MORLEY: There will be at least two occasions when, if the House thinks fit, this discussion can take place.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Is it the fact that the trouble arises out of excessive taxation, and the starvation resulting from it?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member must give notice of that Question.

### Nairobi Incident.

MR. CARLILE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies on what date a telegram was sent by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Acting-Commissioner at Nairobi, or to the Commissioner for British East Africa, in which the noble Lord said that he presumed that legal proceedings had been taken against the ringleaders in the Nairobi incident.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The telegram was sent on 18th March.

### Panama Canal Works.

MR. J. WARD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state whether a correct record is kept of all emigrants from Trinidad and other British possessions to, and for the purpose of working upon, the Panama Canal; whether any record is kept of the rate of sickness and mortality among such emigrants while working upon the canal; and whether, in view of the nature of the work, any action is being taken to protect the interests of such emigrants.

MR. CHURCHILL: As regards the first part of the Question I would refer to the Answer I gave to the hon. Member for Sunderland on Tuesday last.† The rest of the Question should be addressed to my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. It is not possible for the Colonial Governments to do more than supervise recruiting and see that the terms of contracts are satisfactory.

### British Indians in Natal.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the appeal of Ameer and others to the Supreme Court of Natal from the adverse decision of the licensing officer, supported by that of the Municipal Board of Appeal of Ladysmith, whereby, under powers vested in them by the Natal Dealers' Licences Act, they had refused to renew shop licences of British-Indian applicants, who had in some cases been established as long as twenty-three years; whether he had read the evidence which showed that the adverse decision of the Municipal Board of Appeal had been arrived at without its having before it the records of the matter that was *sub judice*; whether he had noticed the criticism of the Chief Justice of Natal; and whether he would make further representations to the Government of that Colony on the subject of the manner in which the law in question was being administered.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, but inquiry shall be made.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is it not the case that intervention on behalf of the Indians is far more likely to prejudice than to help their case in the Colony?

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not think that would be the result of any intervention.

### Brooketon Collieries.

SIR E. SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can inform the House as to whether any definite answer has been received and any decision arrived at concerning the insistence on, or the withdrawal of, the proposed tax on coal raised in the Brooketon collieries, which are being opened out and worked at a serious financial loss by the Rajah of Sarawak.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir; the Question is still under consideration.

SIR E. SASSOON: May I ask my right hon. friend if he is aware that six whole months have elapsed since the reference of the matter to the Commissioner; that the harassment and uncertainty are hurtful to a struggling industry; and would he suggest to the Secretary of State the policy of the administration of ginger to the Department of the Colonial Office concerned?

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 59–60.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I will endeavour to have the matter expedited. I admit it has taken a long time.

### Colonial Conference Reports.

Mr. HILLS (Durham): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any *précis* of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference is being published in the Colonies; and, if so, whether it is being published officially.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The daily *précis* issued by the Colonial Office is communicated to the Colonial Press Agencies with others for transmission to the Colonies. I am not aware that any other *précis* is being published there.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if the Government has taken into consideration whether it would not be wise for the Conference to employ its own officials for making the *précis* rather than employ the officials of the Colonial Office, over whom they have no control?

Mr. CHURCHILL: If that question suggests that the officials of the Colonial Office who have been making the *précis* have not endeavoured to make a fair one, or that, having that intention, they have not been able to carry their intention out, I think the suggestion ought not to be made.

Mr. J. WARD: Has the right hon. Gentleman heard anything of complaints from the Colonial Premiers themselves?

Mr. CHURCHILL: No, Sir.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): Who pays these officials?

Mr. CHURCHILL: The whole cost is borne by us.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Does not the Conference intend to make the official secretariat which is to be established responsible for the *précis* in future?

Mr. CHURCHILL: That is a Question which I cannot refer to conveniently by Question and Answer across the floor of the House. No doubt at a later date, when the organisation of the secretariat is completed, the House will desire some further statement.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Imperial Conference has decided that its proceedings shall be published in *in extenso.*

Mr. CHURCHILL: As will be seen by reference to the *précis* of 10th May, the Conference has decided to "publish its proceedings, subject to any necessary revision or omissions." It is expected that publication will take place at an early date.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: When will the Paper be laid on the Table? The Government proceedings relating to preference might be hurried on.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I will do my best to expedite the publication of these Papers. I should not think the delay would be very long, but, of course, it is necessary for the statements of each member of the Conference to be corrected. The preference portions of the discussion will certainly be published.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): Can it be arranged that *in extenso* reports shall be published and forwarded to the Colonial Premiers before they leave this country?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not think I can promise that. It depends on how long the Colonial Premiers stay.

### Colonial Policy on Preference.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, during the present Colonial Conference, any offer has been made by any of the Colonial Premiers to admit British goods to any Colonial market upon terms of equality or approximate equality with goods produced in that Colony; and whether His Majesty's Ministers, in their negotiations with the Premiers, have given any pledge or undertaking which departs from the declaration made by the Secretary of State who presided over the Conference of 1902, that we cannot pay for any preference unless it enables us to enter the Colonial market upon terms of greater equality with the Colonial producer.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Colonial Premiers have made it clear to His Majesty's Government that as their policy is to protect their home producers from British or foreign competition they cannot in any way reciprocate the free and unrestricted access accorded to them in the markets of Great Britain. His Majesty's Government, on the other hand, are not prepared to place new taxes upon foreign imports into the United Kingdom for the purpose of affording any further advantage to the self-governing Colonies. No question has arisen of balancing a change in the Colonial policy of protection against a change in the free trade policy of the United Kingdom.

### British East Africa—The Senoussi Movement.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government can lay any Papers regarding the alleged spread of the Senoussi movement from its centre in the Libyan Desert to the British East Africa Protectorate.

MR. CHURCHILL: There is no information in the Colonial Office indicating that the Senoussi movement is spreading to the British East Africa Protectorate, and therefore I am unable to lay any Papers.

### Distress in Transvaal Colony.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the degree of poverty and distress now prevailing in the rural districts of the Transvaal Colony; and whether His Majesty's Government propose to take any action in the matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: Any distress which may exist is a matter which must be dealt with by the responsible Government of the Colony, but my hon. and gallant friend has no doubt noted that His Majesty's Government propose to guarantee a loan of £5,000,000 to the Transvaal.

SIR GILBERT PARKER inquired if any part of the £5,000,000 loan for the Transvaal was to be devoted to the relief of the settlers?

MR. CHURCHILL was understood to reply that a portion would be devoted to works which would be of advantage to the settlers.

### Unlicensed Chinese Coolies.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, at any time since the discovery by Lord Selborne that 259 Chinese coolies were being imported into the Transvaal who were not licensed as required by law, any licences have been issued to legalise their position; and, if not, under what law or authority they are detained in compounds.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am not precisely informed as to the formal steps which were taken to cure the vexatious error to which my hon. friend refers. No one at present has been in a position to decide which particular 259 coolies were those who were illegally imported. The matter now lies wholly within the authority of the responsible Government. If my hon. friends thinks it necessary I will make more detailed inquiries, but the incident must now be regarded mainly in its historic aspect.

MR. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the impossibility of identifying which 259 of the entire cargo of 2,129 coolies arriving by the "Cranley" were not covered by the licence, he will say how any one of the 2,129 has been identified as being subject to the terms of the Ordinance; and by what authority any one of the 2,129 is detained in a compound, or otherwise subjected to the restrictions of the Ordinance.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Ordinance applies to all labourers introduced into the Colony and its application is not I understand dependent on the issue of the licence.

### Johannesburg Miners' Strike.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Colonial Office is in possession of any information which can be given to the House as to the causes and extent of the strike of white labourers in the mines at Johannesburg; and whether any coloured labourers have joined in the strike.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have no information other than that which appears in the newspapers. Lord Selborne will no doubt report to us in his regular duty upon the general course of affairs in the Transvaal; and transmit to the Secretary of State any Minutes which the responsible Ministers of that Colony may lay before him. I have every reason to believe that the Government of the Transvaal would be desirous of affording all possible information to the House of Commons upon the condition of affairs in the Colony; and the Secretary of State will not hesitate to apply to them whenever necessity arises. But I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me that special inquiries should be limited to extraordinary occasions, and I see no reason to suppose that anything had occurred which is of an extraordinary character, or with which the Transvaal Government is not fully competent to deal.

### Assouan Dam—British Labour.

MR. J. WARD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state the number of Europeans who found employment upon the original works of the great barrage at Assouan, and the proportion of British workmen compared with other nationalities.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir EDWARD GREY): By the end of December, 1898, 2,900 men were employed, of whom 271 were Europeans. During the summer months of 1899, the average number of men employed was 10,000, of whom some 900 were Europeans. In 1900, 381 Europeans were employed in the work, and an average of 12,500 natives. Of the total workmen employed, about 5 per cent. were British. They were employed as gangers, overlookers, fitters, crane-drivers, and carpenters; but they were not able to deal with the general work, partly for reasons of climate, and partly on account of the prior claims of the native workmen from the neighbouring villages.

MR. J. WARD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any representations have been made to Messrs. John Aird and Son that in performing the work necessary for raising the barrage at Assouan a fair proportion of British workmen should be employed upon that part of the work which can only be performed by Europeans.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Messrs. Aird are themselves a British firm, but I am not aware that conditions have been made with them as to the nationality of workmen. They will no doubt take care that competent men are employed, as they have done before. But, as His Majesty's Government do not pay any part of the cost of the work, they clearly are not in a position to impose stipulations of the kind proposed.

### Shanghai Street Murder.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to the circumstances under which Municipal Police-constable Morrow was murdered in the streets of Shanghai on 11th March whilst trying to prevent a burglary and arrest the burglars; and whether he will aproach the Chinese Government with a view to obtaining compensation for the dependent relatives of the constable.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The reply to the first Question is in the affirmative. His Majesty's Government see no grounds in this case for claiming compensation from the Chinese Government. The murder took place in a district where the police are those of the European Municipality, and not of the Chinese Government.

MR. LONSDALE: Is it not the fact that the murder took place on the border line between British and Chinese territory?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Our information is that it was in the territory protected by the British police.

MR. LONSDALE: Will the hon. Gentleman inquire if it did not actually take place on Chinese territory?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Inquiry has already been made and I have given the House the result.

MR. LONSDALE asked as to compenation for the relatives of the murdered man.

*MR. SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that.

### The Congo.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information to the effect that real agreement exists as regards the annexation of the Congo to Belgium.

MR. RUNCIMAN: His Majesty's Government have no other information on the subject beyond the announcement recently made by the new Belgian Prime Minister that his Government are about to introduce a measure for the annexation of the Congo Free State, and will ask Parliament to vote it simultaneously with a new law for the future Government of the Colony.

### Imperial Trade.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what practical steps it is proposed to take to carry out the view of His Majesty's Government as expressed to the Imperial Conference on 6th May, 1907, and reported in the official summary issued by the Colonial Office, that the Empire would be a great gainer if much that was now bought from foreign countries could be produced and purchased within the Empire.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (MR. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this Question in the absence of the Prime Minister, who is meeting Lord Cromer. The promotion of inter-Imperial trade by any suitable means consistent with the special conditions and interests of the various parts of the Empire is a matter which continues to engage the earnest attention of His Majesty's Government. At the present moment I fear I cannot add to this statement.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I want to know how the Government is going to give effect to this declaration by a very important member of the Ministry.

MR. ASQUITH: I am afraid my hon. and gallant friend must possess his soul in patience.

### Colonial Conference.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, with reference to the official report of his address to the Colonial Conference, if he can state what was the value of manufactures imported into this country from British Possessions and from the self-governing Colonies respectively, in 1905.

MR ARKWRIGHT (Hereford): At the same time may I ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, with reference to the official report of his address to the Imperial Conference, if he can state what was the value of food, drink, and tobacco imported into this country from British Possessions and from the self-governing Colonies respectively, in 1905.

The following Question on the same subject also appeared on the Paper:—

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, with reference to the official report of his address to the Imperial Conference, if he can state what was the value of raw materials imported into this country from British Possessions and from the self-governing Colonies in 1905, respectively.

MR. ASQUITH: I dealt in my address to the Imperial Conference with the Colonial returns of exports from the self-governing Colonies to the United Kingdom, which show the values at the ports of embarkation. Our own import statistics show the values as imported, and therefore include the costs incidental to sea-transport. They also differ from the returns of exports published by self-governing Colonies in so far as they do not include the great bulk of the diamonds imported from Cape Colony, such diamonds being not in general declared to the Customs on importation. (See Annual Statement of Trade of United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions for 1905, Cd. 2928, Vol. 1, page V. and pages 70 and 71, Note.) The values in our returns are those declared upon importation, which are not the same as those given to the Colonial Customs Departments by the exporter, and there is also probably some difference in the description as between raw materials and manufactured articles, owing to the different arrangement of the

Colonial returns. The value of our imports of merchandise, calculated as I have explained, which were consigned from self-governing Colonies and all British Possessions respectively for 1905 are estimated by the Board of Trade to be approximately as follows:—

| Imports of | From Self-Governing Colonies. | From all British Possessions. |
|---|---|---|
| | Million £. | Million £. |
| Food, Drink, and Tobacco - - | 33 | 58 |
| Raw Materials and Articles mainly unmanufactured - | 32¾ | 52 |
| Articles wholly or mainly manufactured (including a small quantity of unclassified articles and parcels post) - | 5¼ | 16½ |
| | 71 | 126½ |

MR. PIKE PEASE asked why the Colonial returns had now been taken, seeing that that had not been the case on previous occasions.

MR. ASQUITH said that the reason why he adopted the Colonial method was because he thought it was right in considering the question whether preference should be given to take the value of the goods at the port of exportation. As the figures showed, however, he deliberately adopted those figures which were least favourable to his own argument.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with reference to the official report of his address to the Imperial Conference, whether the burden of the Canadian tariff upon United Kingdom produce, as compared with United States produce, has been progressively altered since 1897 in favour of the United Kingdom.

MR. ASQUITH: The *ad valorem* equivalent of the duty actually levied in Canada on all imports (including both free and dutiable goods) from the United States since preferential treatment was accorded to United Kingdom goods in 1897 has remained practically stationary at 12 or 13 per cent. The *ad valorem* equivalent in the case of goods from the United Kingdom declined from about 20 per cent. prior to 1898–99 to 17 per cent. in 1902–3. Since then it has increased to 19 per cent. I will have the figures for each year printed in the votes. I should add that we have not yet had sufficient experience of the new Canadian tariff to determine what change (if any) it will produce.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Arising out of that, may I ask whether the difference of duty between the United States and Canada is not due to the different class of the imports—that is to say, to the raw material half manufactured, chiefly imported from the United States.

MR. ASQUITH: I pointed out that to the Colonial Conference.

*MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.) asked whether it was not the case that, wherever the preferential tariff of 33⅓ per cent. had been shown to be of any decided advantage to British importers, it had been whittled away by subsequent amendments.

MR. ASQUITH: I would not say that they have been whittled away, but the figures are those I have just stated.

### The Finance Bill.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer how far Section 133 of the Act of 1842 is referred to or incorporated in other enactments; and whether the repeal of that section in Clause 23 of the Finance Bill is modified in any way by the wording of Clause 28 and the Third Schedule.

MR. ASQUITH: The machinery provided under Section 133 of the Income-Tax Act, 1842, for repayment of tax is expressly applied by Section 27 of the Finance Act, 1896, for the purpose of the relief from tax given by that section to persons chargeable under Schedule B. The words in the Third Schedule of the Bill modifying the repeal are inserted only for the purpose of enabling that machinery still to be used for that particular purpose. The modification of the repeal does not in the least affect the substantial operation of Clause 23 in preventing any relief from tax being given in the future under the provisions of Section 133.

### Income-Tax Refunds.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if the increase in the amount of income-tax refunded, under the provisions of Section 133 of the Act of 1842, during the years 1904, 1905, and 1906, is owing to larger decreases during those years in the profits liable to income-tax, or to a larger number of income-tax payers becoming acquainted with, and taking advantage of, the provisions for repayment under this section.

MR. ASQUITH: The increase is mainly due to a fall in profits of coal from the abnormally high returns obtained in the years 1899–1900. The increased activity of repayment agents has also contributed, in all probability, to some extent.

### Income-Tax on Divided Profits.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in the case of an earned income of over £2,000 from a business belonging to a number of persons but which, when divided among the several partners, is to each partner an income under that sum, will the income-tax be charged at 9d. in the pound; and if in first place, a 1s. in the pound is charged, will the difference be returned.

MR. ASQUITH: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. As regards the second part, my hon. friend will see, if he refers to Clause 18 (4) of the Finance Bill, that the proposal is that the relief must be claimed when the partners make their return for assessment.

### Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what amounts of Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills respectively, were outstanding on 10th May 1907.

MR. ASQUITH: The amounts outstanding on that date were:—Exchequer Bonds: £18,161,500. Treasury Bills: £10,713,000. Particulars of the Exchequer Bonds were furnished in my Answer to the hon. Member for Luton on the 9th instant.†

### Marine Biological Association.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Departmental Committee on the question of a grant to the Marine Biological Association has yet been set; and, if so, who has been selected as chairman; and if every care will be taken to secure evidence of knowledgeable witnesses.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The composition of the Committee has not yet been determined. The selection of witnesses will rest with the Committee when appointed.

### Transvaal Loan.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if it will be necessary to introduce a Bill into this House for the purpose of guaranteeing the proposed Transvaal loan of £5,000,000; and, if not, what opportunity this House will have of discussing the proposal.

MR. ASQUITH: The Answer is in the affirmative.

### Vaccination and Education.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the desirability of introducing legislation to assimilate the practice with regard to compulsory State education to that now existing in the case of compulsory State vaccination, under which a conscientious objection or one fine absolves the parent from the consequences of not complying with the statute.

MR. ASQUITH: I do not see any connection in principle between the two matters referred to.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 344.

### Trawlers' Regulation Bill.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will withdraw the Government opposition to the Trawlers' Regulation Bill.

MR. ASQUITH: In the opinion of the Government this is not a Bill which should be read a second time without discussion.

MR. MORTON: Is it any use trying to protect line fishermen if no effort is made to compel trawlers to obey the law?

MR. ASQUITH: I should think not.

DR. RUTHERFORD: Will the right hon. Gentleman use his influence with the hon. Member for Dumfries Burghs to induce him to withdraw his blocking Motion and allow the question to be discussed next Wednesday?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Juvenile Offenders.

SIR E. SASSOON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the prevalence of crimes committed by boys between the ages of twelve and fifteen, he would consider the expediency of instituting an inquiry into the working and provisions of the Youthful Offenders Act.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The statistics of committals to prisons and to reformatory schools suggest a decrease rather than an increase in crimes by boys under sixteen. It may be that magistrates have not made so much use as was hoped of some of the provisions of the Youthful Offenders Act; but I do not think that any formal inquiry into the working of the Act is necessary. Magistrates have various means of dealing with youthful offenders, and further assistance will be put at their disposal by the Probation of Offenders Bill now before this House, but it must be left to the magistrates to decide which is the best method in any given case.

### Expulsion of Aliens.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the case under the Aliens Act, on the 8th instant, of the German who was expelled from this country under a magistrate's order, but who stated at the Thames police court that he had not been allowed to remain in Germany; and whether he will take an early oportunity of amending the Act in the direction of keeping objectionable characters and criminals out of the country.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am aware of the case referred to. If, as in this instance, an alien criminal who has been expelled from this country is imprisoned as soon as he is found here again, that seems to me to be the best protection that we can secure.

### Street Betting Act—Effect on Race Meetings.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the increase in the number of people attending race meetings since the passing of the Street Betting Act and to the increase in the receipts of the continental pari-mutuels since the suppression of open betting; and whether, in view of these indications of the effect of legislative interference with the sporting proclivities of the people, he will consider the desirableness of introducing legislation with the object of restoring to the working clases the opportunities they formerly possessed of gratifying such proclivities without having recourse to continental betting agencies or attending race meetings.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have read the newspaper cuttings which my hon. friend has sent me, but I do not think it desirable to introduce legislation of the kind suggested.

### Edalji Case.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether a very considerable amount of additional evidence has been received at the Home Office in reference to the Edalji case; and whether he can make any statement in regard to the Report of the Committee recently appointed.

MR. GLADSTONE: I can make no statement at the moment, but I hope in the course of a day or two to lay on the Table the Report presented to me by Sir A. Wilson and his colleagues with an announcement of my decision.

### Dangerous Goods on Railways.

MR. BRUNNER (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that railway companies have recently removed goods to the dangerous class which have for years been carried at Class 2 rates; and whether he will introduce legislation to amend 8 and 9 Vic., c. 20, s. 105, to give a right of appeal from such a decision to the Board of Trade or the Railway Commissioners.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I do not know what goods my hon. friend has in his mind, but the only recent complaint that has come to the notice of the Board of Trade referred to varnishes, which were transferred in 1905 to the dangerous goods class without, however, as I understand, raising the rates at which they were carried. The section of the Act of 1845 to which attention is drawn relieves railway companies from the obligation to carry goods which, in their opinion, are dangerous, but I do not gather from the Question that it is alleged that the companies have refused to carry the goods alluded to. Under the Railway Rates Provisional Order Confirmation Acts of 1891–2, the rates at which dangerous goods are carried must be reasonable, and I see no reason why these rates could not be challenged if desired before the Railway and Canal Commission.

### Workmen's Fares on the District Railway.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been directed to the fact that, in spite of Section 90 of the Metropolitan District Railway Company's Act of 1864, which requires the company to run one train daily in each direction between High Street, Kensington, and Aldgate, at a fare not exceeding 1d. for each journey, the company, since September, 1906, have charged workmen 3d. for the return journey; and whether he intends to take any action to compel the company to fulfil their statutory obligation in the matter.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I must refer my hon. friend to the reply given to a Question on this subject put by the hon. Member for Hoxton on Thursday last.

### Duties on Government Stores landed in South Africa.

MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state the value of Government stores landed in South Africa during each of the years 1904, 1905, and 1906, and whether the South African Governments levied duties, and, if so, at what rates, upon these stores.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I will have such particulars as are available with regard to the imports of Colonial Government stores imported into South Africa printed in the Votes. No information is available in the Colonial Trade Statistics as to the value of Imperial Government stores imported. No duties are levied on Imperial or Colonial Government stores on importation into South Africa.

The particulars referred to are as follows:—

The following statement shows the approximate value of Colonial Government stores imported into British South Africa (so far as the particulars are available) in each of the years 1904, 1905, and 1906:—

Extracted from Colonial Trade Returns.

| Imports into South Africa *via* Ports in | 1904. | 1905. | 1906. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | £ | £ | £ |
| Cape of Good Hope - - - - | 1,829,000 | 467,000 | 610,000 |
| Natal - - - - - - - | (*b*) 1,193,000 | 568,000 | 646,000 |
| Transvaal (*via* Delagoa Bay and Beira) - - - - - - | Particulars not available. | | 499,000 |

(*b*) Exclusive of £22,492 imported into Natal as merchandise, but delivered free of duty for military purposes.

NOTE.—The above figures represent the value of the imports of Colonial Government stores. Figures for Imperial Government stores are not available.

### Supply of Electricity Bill.

MR. HAY MORGAN (Cornwall, Truro): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it is his intention to re-introduce in any form the Supply of Electricity Bill, founded on the recommendations of the Joint Select Committee of 1898 on Electrical Energy.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I hope to introduce the Bill as soon as I can see a reasonable prospect of its being proceeded with.

### Colonial Trade and Tariffs.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state approximately what was the amount of the duties payable in the United Kingdom on goods coming from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and British South Africa, respectively, during 1906; and what was the amount of the duties payable in these Colonies, respectively, on goods going there from the United Kingdom in the last year for which figures are available.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: With regard to the first part of the Question I would refer the hon. Member to the answer given to a somewhat similar question which he asked on the 30th ultimo.† The Customs duty collected on imports into Canada from the United Kingdom was £2,661,000 in 1905–6. Corresponding figures for the other Colonies mentioned cannot be given.

### Industrial Insurance.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been drawn to the way in which industrial insurance companies levying premiums by small weekly payments conduct their business, and the amount of dissatisfaction existing amongst the poorer classes in consequence; whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a Commission or Committee to ascertain how far the complaints are well founded; and whether legislation or any form of Government control is required under the circumstances.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Up to the present the Board of Trade have received no complaints or information that would justify them in appointing a Committee for the purposes indicated. If, however, the hon. Member will place me in the possession of any facts bearing on the question that may be within his knowledge I will see that they are carefully considered.

### Women on Local Bodies.

MR. RADFORD (Islington, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board when he proposes to introduce the Bill mentioned in the King's Speech enabling women to serve on local bodies.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I had proposed to present the Bill to-day, but I have now arranged that it shall be introduced forthwith in another place.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 674.

### Tuberculosis.

SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has considered the resolutions passed at the meeting of the National Association for the Prevention of Consumption and other forms of Tuberculosis, urging immediate action in Parliament in pursuance of the recommendations on the recent Report of the Royal Commission on Tuberculosis; and whether he is now able to state what steps will be taken to give effect to those recommendations.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am aware that resolutions have been passed at the meeting referred to; but I have not at present received copies of them. The recommendations of the Royal Commission relate to matters of much moment, and I am not at present in a position to make any definite statement with regard to the action which should be taken in consequence of them. They are, however, receiving my consideration.

### Hammersmith Workhouse.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what was the total cost of the construction and equipment of the Hammersmith Workhouse and Infirmary at Wormwood Scrubbs.

MR. JOHN BURNS: According to the information at present in my possession, the total cost, including the cost of the site, has amounted to £261,526.

*MR. REES: What is the number of paupers to be accommodated and the cost per bed?

MR. JOHN BURNS: The number of paupers to be accommodated is 780, and the cost per bed is £335.

MR. CROOKS: Where's Poplar after that?

*MR. REES: Who guards the guardians?

MR. JOHN BURNS: At this moment I am doing my best in that direction.

### British Museum Contract.

MR. J. WARD: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he has any information as to the sub-letting of the scaffolding by Messrs. Waring and Company in the contract for alterations at the British Museum; whether subletting and piece-work is prohibited by the terms of their contract; and, if so, what action, if any, it is proposed to take in the matter.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): I have made careful inquiries in this matter and I find that the scaffolding has not been sublet nor does piece-work enter into the arrangements in regard to it.

### Canadian Live Cattle Trade.

SIR F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the speech of the right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at the Colonial Conference, in which he is reported to have said that Canada resented the prohibition of the importation of Canadian live cattle as an injustice; and whether the Minister of Agriculture proposes to introduce legislation to restore to the Board the discretionary powers exercised by them prior to the Act of 1896, so that Canadian live cattle may be admitted under proper inspection and regulations.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (SIR EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): My noble friend has read the speech to which my hon. friend refers, and he will of course give most respectful consideration to the representations made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on behalf of the Canadian Government. The Act of 1896 is, as my hon. friend probably knows, applicable to all cattle brought from beyond the seas, and has no special reference to the Dominion of Canada.

MR. CATHCART WASON: Is that speech properly attributed to Sir Wilfrid Laurier?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I cannot add anytthing to my Answer.

SIR F. CAWLEY: I took it from *The Times*.

### Wiltshire Swine Fever Order.

MR. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been called to the fact that the effect of the Wiltshire Swine Fever Order of 1907, in so far as it limits the movements of swine for breeding purposes, is to cause the greatest inconvenience to all engaged in the industry of pig breeding; whether a resolution of the committee of the Wilts County Council concerned with the administration of the Diseases of Animals Acts has been received by the Board, pointing out the inconvenience caused by the Order and strongly urging the reduction in the period of time necessary before a removal order is granted for breeding purposes, from twenty-eight to twenty days; and whether, in view of the almost prohibitive effect which the present Order is causing on pig breeding, owing to the operation of natural causes which govern the industry, he will consider the possibility of making the reduction asked for.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: We have given very careful consideration to the resolution to which my hon. friend refers, but in view of the serious increase of swine fever both in Wiltshire and in the surrounding counties during the present year we should not at present be justified in giving increased facilities for the movement of swine for breeding purposes, a proceeding which is always attended with special danger so far as the spreading of disease is concerned. We fully recognise, however, the inconvenience and loss which the regulations entail, and we shall be very glad indeed to relax them at the earliest possible moment consistent with safety.

### Scottish Parochial Relief Census.

MR. ESSLEMONT (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether a census of persons in receipt of parochial relief in Scotland has been taken; and, if so, will he state the total number and how many are between the ages of sixteen and sixty.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Such a census was taken at 31st March, 1906, for the information of the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws, and it is within their discretion to publish it in their Report.

### Close Time for Lobsters.

MR. J. DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he has received a memorial from a body of fishermen on the West Coast of Scotland asking that a close time for lobster fishing may be established; and if he is prepared favourably to consider this request.

MR. SINCLAIR: I have received the memorial which was sent me by my hon. friend. The question was very fully considered in 1905, and it was then decided to make no change in existing policy and practice; and in view of the short lapse of time since the matter was inquired into, there does not appear any justification for modifying the conclusions then arrived at.

### Scottish Education Financial Reports.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, seeing that the delay in the publication of the accountant's Annual Reportsto the Scottish Education Department renders those Reports practically valueless except as historical records, he will endeavour to arrange that they be published at least within eight or nine months after the expiry of the year to which they relate.

MR. SINCLAIR: School Boards are allowed by statute to 1st January in each year for sending in their accounts for the financial year ending 15th May preceding. Notwithstanding that every effort is made by the Department to get these accounts submitted at an earlier date than the statutory one, many school boards delay sending in their accounts till after the prescribed date, even into the months February and March. In these circumstances, it will be seen that the delay in the publication of the accountant's Annual Report is not attributable to the accountant, but is due to the delay of school boards in forwarding their accounts to him.

### Irish Council Bill.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the far-reaching effect of the new Irish Council Bill, he will undertake to allow the fullest possible discussion of its details through all its stages in this House.

MR. ASQUITH: There will be the fullest opportunity for the discussion of this Bill that may be consistent with the requirements of the business of the House.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Will the Government not take into consideration the far-reaching effect of this Bill and see that proper time is given for the fullest discussion.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is the same question put in other words.

### Tullamore Whisky Frauds.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is intended to prosecute any person under the criminal law in connection with the whisky frauds at Tullamore; can he say who was or were the person or persons who profited by said frauds, and the estimated amount of such profit; and has anything been recovered from him, her, or them as the result of civil proceedings.

MR. ASQUITH: There is not at present sufficient evidence to warrant a prosecution under the criminal law. The second part of the Question relates to matters in regard to which I have at present no definite information. Nothing as yet has been recovered as the result of the civil proceedings.

---

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked as to the Supply to be taken next Thursday, and on the two days after the holidays?

MR. ASQUITH asked that the latter part of the Question should be deferred till the next day. With regard to the first part he said that on Thursday the Government proposed to take Votes 13, 14, 18, and 19 of Class I. of the Civil Service Estimates, and the Vote for the non-effective and charitable services.

---

## PUBLIC COMPANIES AND POLITICAL FUNDS.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) asked leave of the House to make a statement on a personal matter. He recalled that on 19th March, speaking on the London and North-Western Railway Bill, he stated that in the past the board had not contributed 1s. to any political fund. The hon. Member for Denbigh District challenged that statement and declared that the directors had subscribed to the Free Labour Association for the purpose of agitating in favour of contracting-out of the Employers' Liability Bill. He repeated his statement, and the hon. Member for Denbigh again asserted that the company had given 25 guineas to the Free Labour Association. On 25th April, he told the House that, having made the most minute and careful inquiries, he could not find the least trace of the company ever having given, directly or indirectly, any money to this association, and he thereupon asked the hon. Member to withdraw his statement. The hon. Member replied that he had made the most careful and exhaustive inquiries into the evidence on which his statement was based, and had come to the conclusion that the evidence as to the accuracy of the statement was overwhelming. He added that he had traced the whereabouts of John Sennett, the founder and secretary of the Free Labour Association, and that he had a sworn statement from that person, which he read to the House. It was left to the House to infer that he had made a statement which was, to put it mildly, inaccurate. The majority in that House had been invariably generous in accepting his statements, and he was anxious to prove to the House that the statement he made was not only true, but that it was not in any way misleading. He had never, up to that time heard anything of Mr. Sennett, or of Mr. Ellis, who was alleged to have paid this money to the Free Labour Association on behalf of the company. But he thought it was due to the House to know the character of the man whose sworn statement the hon. Member for Denbigh asked the House to accept in contradiction of his statement.

He had been convicted six times either in his own name or in another name.

[The right hon. Gentleman gave the particulars of the convictions.]

He ventured to ask the House whether the evidence of a man of that kind ought to be put forward in contradiction of the statement he had made. He had also an affidavit of William Ellis.

[The right hon. Gentleman read the terms of the affidavit, in the course of which Mr. Ellis said—"I repudiate the statement made by John Sennett to the effect that he received £25 or any sum whatever from the London and North-Western Railway Company or from the Mutual Insurance Society of the company, or from any section of their employees. It is a deliberate falsehood on the part of Mr. Sennett to make any such statement."]

In the face of these facts, he asked the hon. Member whether he did not think the House ought to believe the statement he had made on two previous occasions?

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District) said he would like to repeat what he said on the last occasion, that he had no intention whatever of reflecting on the personal accuracy or the personal honour of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. He thought he had made it perfectly plain on the previous occasion that the affidavit which was handed to him by a solicitor and his inquiries were two perfectly independent matters. He had a report of Mr. Ellis's speech which appeared in the official gazette of the National Free Labour Association and in which he stated that he represented the London and North-Western Insurance Society. He had a great mass of information, such information as he believed would convince the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that his (Colonel Lockwood's) information was not correct and that his own information was correct. It was not a question of the personal accuracy of either of them. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had been supplied with certain information; he (Mr. Edwards) had been supplied with certain information. He did not know whether he should trouble the House with it in detail, but he would like to know whether there was any machinery by means of which the whole of the information could be laid before an independent Committee which might see on which side accuracy lay in this matter. But with regard to the statement of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, if he had said anything which seemed to convey, by the merest suggestion, any reflection on his personal accuracy, or his personal honour, he absolutely and unhesitatingly withdrew it.

## LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Reported, with an Amendment, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 153.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 153.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Wednesday, and to be printed. [Bill 192.]

## AUSTRALIAN STATES CONSTITUTION BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 27th May, and to be printed. [Bill 193.]

## NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Frederick Leverton Harris, esquire, for the Parliamentary Borough of the Tower Hamlets (Stepney Division.)

## LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND).

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs), in asking leave to introduce a Bill for the ascertainment of land values in Scotland, said the provisions of the Bill were of the simplest character, so simple as to prompt the hope that it would be treated as non-controversial. He might explain at once that the Bill was not a rating measure. Its provisions were concerned with valuation alone, and indeed it was expressly laid down that until Parliament otherwise determined, no person should be liable to be taxed or rated in respect of the entry prescribed by this Act. The Bill derived much of its simplicity from being founded upon the existing law and practice in Scotland. It might assist the House and help it to understand the measure if he endeavoured in brief to explain what the law and practice was. In Scotland there had been since 1854, in every county or borough, a uniform system of valuation founded upon the system of annual rental, or upon the estimate of what the subject matter of the agreement would let for, one year with another. The valuation was an annual one. Its cash was provided for by the rates, collected in the poor rate, and it was conducted by a body of assessors who were men of experience, skill, and capacity, and who formed along with their staff, locally and nationally, an instrument of acknowledged efficiency. By these men and their staff the valuation rolls were made up. In the early stages, these rolls contained five columns, viz., for the subject, the proprietor, the tenant, the occupier, and the yearly rental valuation. Very soon, however, it was discovered that the valuation roll might be useful for national purposes, by the insertion of further columns. Thus, under the County Voters Registration Act, 1861, Chapter 83, there was inserted a further column of feu-duties and ground values affecting the subject. Then in 1884, under the Representation of the People Act, 45 Vic. c. 3, two further columns were also inserted of inhabitant occupiers, who might be claimants under the service franchise. The annual valuation rolls formed the statutory basis of all assessment, and in later years had formed the statutory basis of enrolment for the franchise, and it might be said, without hesitation, that the scheme of the system had worked throughout the whole of Scotland with complete smoothness, precision and efficiency. It had never been repealed, it had several times been added to by Act of Parliament to the public advantage, and so the early plan of amplifying the valuation roll by the formation of additional columns was the plan which had been adopted in this Bill. An additional column was to be made containing entries under the heading of "Capital Land Values." In this column, and opposite each entry therein, would appear a statement of the capital land value of the subject, while the mechanism was the familiar and simple one he had described. The Government were well aware of the importance of the addition which the Bill prescribed. The fact was that the basis of the annual return had been found in many cases to be a misleading guide to actual valuation. In some cases land was unoccupied, in others it was occupied by a return totally out of proportion to the return which reasonable use of the subject would yield. There were also, as the House well knew, amazing discrepancies between the value for assessment and the value for transfer. There was the consciousness that the difference had been largely created by the enterprise of the community; and there was finally the need of dissevering from land, as a basis for assessment, the buildings and structural improvements thereon, and so far encouraging instead of discouraging the latter. When he added that there were disputed propositions with regard to almost every item of this catalogue, the House would recognise the importance of the first step being confined to valuation alone. Section 1 of the Bill accordingly provided for the column and the entries mentioned, and the second section modified the existing Valuation Acts, giving powers to call for particulars applicable to capital value in the same sense as the existing section applied to annual value. There was the same duty upon the proprietor of making a return. The definitions to which much importance might naturally be attached were contained in the third section and would appear fully in the text of the Bill. "Capital land value" was in the Bill simply what the land might be expected to realise in the open market if divested of improvements thereon. The feasibility of the valuation had been proved by witnesses of the highest standing, and as to the risk of under-valuing which would always be put forward in such cases, although the Bill was not an assessing or a rating Bill, still the entries which would be adjusted after returns were made by the proprietors, would be public facts, and no doubt proprietors would be fully alive to the consideration that Parliament would be entitled to note these facts as a basis not alone for possible assessment but for purposes of transfer. The Bill did not apply to the lands and heritages falling to be valued by the assessors of railways and canals; in this respect it followed the recommendations of two Parliamentary inquiries. Both Parties in the State, as indeed that day's Order Paper showed, seemed not unnaturally to be engaged in the same search, viz., for the broadening of the basis of taxation, and both parties would admit that it should be sought for without recklessness and with caution and care. It was in that spirit that he asked the House to give the Bill a first reading.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to provide for the ascertainment of land values in Scotland."—(*The Lord Advocate.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the right hon. Gentleman had made it quite clear, with his usual candour, that this Bill, although it might be merely a valuation Bill, was a Bill the whole interest of which was derived from the subsequent legislation which he hoped to be able to found upon it; and it would be, of course, quite impossible for the House, when it discussed the Bill upon the Second Reading, to forget that it was part of a general policy. On that general policy he did not propose now to say anything, but he would remind the Lord Advocate that if it could be shown that any scheme based on the taxation of land values really involved taxing twice for local purposes the same subject that would be a form of public spoliation; and that if it involved anything in the nature of the breaking of contracts in regard to town property between the man who had feued land and the man from whom it was feued that would be in the nature of public spoliation. The cost of the operation would be very great, and he hoped the Lord Advocate would give some estimate before the Second Reading of what he thought that cost would be. The distinction between the house and the land upon which it was built, and the additional value given to the land and house together by the work of the community, was not a value which could by any possibility and by any common sense be divided between the land and house. It was true that the land being built on, the land might grow or fall in value through no effort on the part of the owner. But whether it rose or fell in value, they rose together as one industrial subject or fell as one industrial subject. The Lord Advocate must expect to find that, notwithstanding any doctrine he might oppose to the contrary, the Bill would be subjected to very critical examination. How he was to get a fair system of valuation without dealing with the railways was a matter on which he did not dwell now. He was aware the right hon. Gentleman had behind him on this subject the authority of a Select Committee of this House, but he would find that this was a first step in a policy which was to make it impossible for the owner of land to make such an arrangement with the feuer or hirer of land in Scotland as should relieve the owner of all liability for rates, while depriving the owner of all possible increase in the valuation in the land. If the Lord Advocate's policy was to make that arrangement impossible he would inflict a perfectly unnecessary grievance upon a very large body of owners and investors. Any such inequitable interference with the ownership of land must have the effect of injuring the community at large, and of benefiting nobody. Whether the right hon. Gentleman thought he had found an El Dorado of taxation by which municipal rating might be materially lowered he did not now question, but he wholly disbelieved this was an El Dorado. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman would get, even by the most reputable method of using this new valuation, all he expected, and if he did not tax the same subject twice he did not think he would get anything out of it. But that would be a subject for future examination. He really rose to point out that the Government were again embarking on a question of extreme difficulty which touched very nearly great interests, and affected adversely large masses of property invested by insurance companies, on behalf of every class of the community, and he did not think they were more likely to be successful in this new venture, than, so far as he could judge, they were in the ventures on which they had already embarked.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by the Lord Advocate, Mr. Sinclair, and Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland.

### LAND VALUES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To provide for the ascertainment of Land Values in Scotland," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 27th May, and to be printed. [Bill 194.]

---

### FINANCE BILL.

Order for Second Reading read;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) rose to move, "That, in the opinion of this House, the financial needs of the country, as disclosed in the Budget statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, require that the basis of taxation should be broadened, in order that the anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the present condition of national and imperial trade.' He said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in making his Budget statement, took a somewhat unusual, but, if I may say so, a very commendable course when, instead of confining his survey to the results of the past year, or the needs and the prospects of the present year, he invited the House to take a wider horizon, to look further ahead and to see what our prospects were, as far forward as the Government or the House of Commons could be expected to foretell. We accepted that invitation. We have made that survey to the best of our ability and the Motion standing in my name on the Paper is the result of the consideration we have given to the matter. That Motion, like the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, is of a wider scope than these Motions usually are. It is not intended to embody a particular fact, or merely to indicate objections to individual proposals which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made. It is an appeal to the House and the country to consider whether the time has not come for a complete revision of our fiscal system in order to suit it to the needs of to-day. In our opinion the present system has ceased to be adequate to those needs, and, in a large measure, to meet the very purposes it was created to serve. What is the position that is disclosed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer? It is that, after two prosperous years he finds an inelasticity in the revenue which is certainly, to use his own words, "in some respects disappointing." I made, not when the Chancellor of the Exchequer made his Budget speech last year, but at a later period, when I had returned to the House of Commons, a criticism of his Budget statement, and said that he had under-estimated his revenue for the present year. I make this confession, that if I was right verbally I was wrong in spirit—the Estimates I thought were inaccurate have been painfully accurate. The surplus is due to circumstances on which the right hon. Gentleman has no right to count, and on the recurrence of which he cannot base future expectations. In spite of good trade our taxation on articles of consumption has shown no elasticity. And as to the expansion of the income-tax, I doubt very much whether the whole of that is to be attributed to increased wealth in the country. Some portion of it is; but even then it does not prove that that wealth is well or advantageously distributed from the point of view of the nation as a whole. I doubt whether the expansion of the income-tax in recent years is at all a fair measure of the growth of the wealth of the country. Owing to circumstances the collection of the tax has become much more exact and, I may say, exacting. A great portion of the revenue which formerly could not be collected at the source can now be and is collected at the source, and as commercial activity progresses the tendency of private concerns to be turned into public limited companies continues. A larger and larger portion of income is now earned under circumstances which enable the tax collector to ascertain the full extent of it and to secure its full contribution to the revenue. The expansion of the national income, such as it has been this year, has been mainly due to accidental circumstances. It has been due to the number of very rich men who have died and the extraordinary demand for the coinage of silver. We cannot expect, that to continue or to be repeated year in and year out. We can expect, and I do expect, some expansion in our present duties following on the continuance of good trade, but I do not believe that the resources on which we at present draw are sufficient for our great and growing needs. Our expenditure increases out of all proportion to the yield of our present taxation, and for almost the first time in our financial history we have a Chancellor of the Exchequer coming to this House and declaring, after two properous years, that not only is he unable to make any remission of taxation now, but that, having regard to the demands which he sees coming on him in the course of the next few years, he cannot consent to deal with his surplus, great as the apparent surplus is, in such a way as to involve any permanent diminution of revenue of a substantial character. Accordingly we have no remission of taxation, though we have some readjustments of taxation, upon which I will speak later; but putting them at their brightest and their best, they are not a relief to the taxpayer, but a transference of the burden from one set of shoulders to another. But that is not all. I remember a speech which, owing to circumstances, I have not been able to look up, and therefore I cannot give the Chancellor of the Exchequer's exact words, which the right hon. Gentleman made in Scotland in the course of the last electoral campaign, in which he dealt seriatim with all the principal taxes except those on alcohol, and declared that each of them was too high and ought to be reduced, and that it would be the duty of the right hon. Gentleman and his friends to reduce them. What progress had we made? We have taken a penny off tea, with, I am afraid, very little advantage to the consumer. That is the sum total of the reduction that has been made. But that is not all that the Chancellor of the Exchequer put before the country at that time as his task. The right hon. Gentleman said, and has repeated many times since, and insisted upon it, that one of the primary duties of the Government was to restore the credit of the country. I have already admitted to the right hon. Gentleman, and I stand by the admission, that I think a great many of the criticisms on the credit of the country are grossly exaggerated, and unfair both to him and to his predecessors; but although our credit stands higher than that of any other Power, as measured by the price of Consols, I agree with him that there is urgent reason for bettering our credit still further. Our credit is not merely the price which the obligations which we have already issued stand at in the market; our credit is also our power to borrow in the market again should the emergency arise. Although it can be shown that Consols at their present price are comparatively as high as they were in most previous years, when they paid 3 per cent., who will say what price they would fall to if for any reason it was necessary for the Chancellor of the Exchequer now to make great demands on the money market? We, therefore, cannot measure our credit by the price of Consols. You have something much more intangible, something which you cannot put into figures in the same way, something which must be matter of grave and anxious speculation to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, namely, his resources should an emergency come upon us. His resources for such an emergency are not adequate either in the state of our credit or taxation. There is not a sufficient margin in the taxes as long as they stand at their present level. There is not sufficient margin in our borrowing power as long as our credit does not stand higher than at present. That goes far to make good my case that our present resources are too narrow. But that is not all. It has become a commonplace of our political discussions, and is now admitted by both sides, that a multitude of prophecies, forecasts made at the time when our present system was instituted, have not been fulfilled. I am not here to say that the forecast that not an acre of wheat should go out of cultivation was an unreasonable forecast at the time it was made, or that enlightened men should not honestly believe it, but that forecast has proved false; the forecast that our agriculture would always enjoy a natural protection of 10s. per quarter, that our competitors would be forced within five years to follow our example or be ruined by not doing so, is now gone. But there is something else equally important which has not been recognised, namely, that the fiscal system then established was part of a considered whole, and that it is the only part of that considered whole which now remains extant in our political or national life. The fiscal system then established was intimately associated with the idea that we ought to have and needed only small Budgets, that our national expenditure would be on a small scale. It was intimately connected with the hope and expectation that free trade, or free imports, as adopted by us, would subsequently be adopted by other nations, and that arising from the free flow of commerce a new millennium would shortly be on us, in which armaments would be reduced, war would cease, and the only rivalry between nations would be of a peaceful and friendly character. It was intimately associated with the idea that the self-governing dominions would manage their own affairs independently of us, and that if we could not rid ourselves of the obligations we had incurred in respect of many dependencies, we would at least be careful to take no fresh obligations of that kind upon us. Every one of these expectations has been falsified by the event, and not merely falsified by the event, but they are no longer the aspirations of any considerable body of citizens among us [" Oh."]

MR. MADDISON (Burnley): Is it not an aspiration to desire peace?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, I was not speaking of such aspirations; I was referring to the other part of my observations. I take the question of peace and armaments. The Prime Minister is sanguine, or was sanguine, that he might induce the Conference of the Powers to put some limit on the growth of armaments. I am afraid that he has not a very bright prospect before him. Be that as it may, does any Member believe that we shall ever again see the expenditure of the nations on armaments, I will not say less than when our fiscal system was adopted, but anything approaching that figure? No; they are, and they will remain, far in excess of anything that was contemplated at that time. And in other spheres all the tendency of public opinion, all the progress of legislation, makes it impossible that we should return to the narrow Budgets of the Forties, Fifties, and Sixties. The policy of Free Traders at that time was a consistent whole; it was a policy of *laissez faire* throughout; they wished to restrict Government interference and action within the narrowest limits. With the single exception of the hon. Member for Preston, possibly supported by my hon. friend the junior Member for the City of London—who, after all, I think, is not wholly beyond suspicion—there is not an advocate of that policy in the House of Commons. We are constantly demanding increased action on the part of the State. I believe we rightly demand it. Yes; but it costs money; you cannot have the State interfering in the business, the lives, the safety, the health, the happiness, the food, every detail of daily life of millions of our people, unless you are prepared also for great expenditure on the part of the State on officials, who must be reasonably well paid, if you are to have men of the competence and independence necessary to the proper discharge of their duties. What is the result? Between 1846 and 1849 the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to budget for an annual expenditure of £50,000,000; between 1880 and 1886 the amount had risen from £68,000,000 to £75,000,000. In 1895 the annual expenditure had still further risen to £86,000,000. I have chosen the periods when a Liberal Government was going out of office, in order that I might not be open to the retort that these figures are the result of the Tory or Unionist extravagance. I well remember Mr. Gladstone's denouncing the swollen Budgets of £80,000,000 and, unless my memory serves me ill, he foretold to the House that such large budgets would break down the system of taxation which our fathers had established. To-day, instead of a budget of £80,000,000 you have a budget of £140,000,000. Instead of a prospect of a reduction, we have had, as we all of us can see, an increase going on for years. It may be said that there is now not a prospect of reduction but a prospect of steady increase. You may cut off expenses here and there. You have done something to cut down expenditure on the Army. That means cutting down the number of men you have available in the active forces of the Crown; yet it was hon. Gentlemen opposite who, with such a light heart, cut down those forces to-day, were the first to condemn the late Government when they sent to South Africa more men than any Government had ever pretended to be able to send abroad and still had not enough to meet the crisis which had arisen. You have cut down the Navy, though in so doing you say that our naval strength—a hope, which I trust, is rightly entertained —will not be reduced. But that process cannot go on. If you want to make further reductions there will be a cutting down of the shipbuilding programme, and that will be undermining the future naval supremacy of the country. Then there is the question of education. There is no Party in the House who think it in the least possible to reduce expenditure on education; and I believe each Party, and almost every individual looks forward to a still larger expenditure upon it, Then comes the whole series of social reforms, to the importance of which both Parties are equally alive though we may differ as to the means and solutions which ought to be adopted. Temperance reform, land reform, housing reform, old age pensions, all cost money, and you cannot carry them out with other people's money. You may speculate on behalf of the State in land at the expense of the landlords, but that between private individuals would be called robbery. You might promote temperance reform at the expense of individuals who, under legal encouragement and sanction, have vested their earnings in the licensed trade. But that, too, is wrong; it is not only robbery, but it is killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. What is your object in temperance reform? The object of many, I think, is to hit the brewer or to injure the publican; but that is not the object, I would fain believe, of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Their object is to reduce drinking. But the drink taxes have been in the past one of the mainstays of our revenue, and even now they are one of the largest sources from which we draw money for our national expenditure. You are in the right to encourage temperance. You will be in the right if you encourage it on fair terms, and, as far as sacrifices are necessary, if you exact those sacrifices from the community and not from individuals. Be under no misapprehension as to what you are doing. Just in proportion as you are successful in reducing the consumption of drink, so you are destroying the equilibrium of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget. We find that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has pledged — perhaps he objects to the word "pledged"—has held out hopes of the establishment of a system of old age pensions upon a plan which is the most costly of any that can be devised. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean has referred to my having expressed a desire for a contributory scheme. I am not ashamed of that view. I hold it still. I think that a scheme which recognises the principle embodied in our Compensation Acts, and which, carrying it a step further, recognises that a trade must not only contribute to those engaged in it during sickness or accident, but must also contribute to them in old age, is on a sounder basis than that proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If you recognise the obligation of the individual, if you reduce within manageable limits the contribution which you have to exact from the State, I believe that you would be within measurable distance of a practical scheme of old age pensions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer takes the most costly scheme. He expects to make a great saving in Poor Law expenditure, but the President of the Local Government Board does not. He told us the other day that whatever scheme of old age pensions we had, our Poor Law expenditure would be very little reduced. I agree with what he said. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as I gather, hopes also to limit the initial cost of the scheme by some age rule, or some other exclusion. I venture to say that the establishment of a system of old age pensions begining at the age of seventy-five, or any age like that, would be a mockery. You have to contemplate, in laying the foundations, the whole problem; you have to contemplate so building up your scheme that you will include the whole. In passing, I desire to protest against one form of exclusion which appears to be contemplated by the Government. I was not here when the President of the Local Government Board spoke last Friday; I was not able to be here; but he repeated his references to the number of people who were getting old age pensions from friendly societies and trade unions. I say that it would be not merely a mockery but a scandal to exclude from the benefits of a State scheme those people who have by their own thrift contributed something to provide for themselves in old age. If that was not the meaning—and I do not know at all whether it was or not—of his reference to these societies, then I cannot understand why he introduced that at all, at that moment, into the discussion. Old age pensions, on a broad scheme, if it costs you anything, will cost you from £20,000,000 to £30,000,000. What has the Chancellor of the Exchequer got towards that sum? He has put by, or ear-marked, £2,250,000, which he means, or rather meant to keep as a nest egg for next year. Ah! but how our hopes may be disappointed. On the £2,250,000 his colleagues are already laying greedy hands. The Chief Secretary for Ireland has taken £650,000 as a beginning, in order that the Irish people may not lose the valuable opportunity of receiving education in habits of dignity, self-restraint, and self-government. I should be sorry to put any obstacle in the way of their education in those desirable directions. We have always been told that English government in Ireland was extravagant and costly. But here is the Government trying to establish an Irish Council to do the business which the British Government has hitherto done, and the Irish Council cannot even be launched on its path without being given £650,000 a year more than the British Government has ever spent. Under these circumstances the outlook for the taxpayer is not pleasant. His taxes have to remain where they are, and all we can look forward to is the placing of additional burdens upon the shoulders of the direct taxpayer through the taxing of land or an increase in the death duties or the income-tax, or additional burdens upon the indirect taxpayer by taxing alcohol still further, even if no other articles are included in the Chancellor of the Exchequer's net. To maintain these taxes at there present high level is dangerous — that has been admitted even by the Chancellor of the Exchequer — and to raise them still further would be to increase that danger. I assert that for the new needs that have come into existence new sources of revenue must be found, that more taxes must be imposed, and the net cast more widely. So, and so only, can we diminish the hardships and anomalies which are inseparable from maintaining the existing taxes at excessive rates. The Chancellor of the Exchequer does not take away the hardships and anomalies; he only changes the venue, he only transfers the burden from one place to another. What the Chancellor of the Exchequer has done is to apportion the burden, not according to ability to pay, but according to an entirely arbitrary distinction between earned and unearned income. If the right hon. Gentleman proceeds upon ability to pay he ought to look, not at the question of whether income is earned or not, but to the amount of income available for spending by a prudent possessor, whether the income is of a permanent character or whether it would terminate with the life of the man who draws it, and whether, therefore, he is bound year by year as a prudent man to put by part in order to make provision for his wife and family. I will give instances to show that instead of removing hardships the right hon. Gentleman is only creating them. I asked the other day what was going to be done in regard to the pensions of soldiers and sailors, but that question is evidently being held in suspense. Take, for example, a man part of whose remuneration is held back by the State till he reaches pensionable age. What is the distinction between the pension which the State accumulates for the individual who serves it and a pension which a man accumulates for himself by saving out of his annual income? I might put that into the form of an annuity, and it then becomes exactly analogous to a pension. You cannot persuade men who have worked and laboured, who have denied themselves not only pleasures but comforts in order to make provision for old age, that the pittance they receive year by year when they come to retire has not been earned by the sweat of their brow. I think it will surprise a great number of people to know that under the definition of earnings adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer a man who writes a book or patents an invention is not to be deemed to have earned anything which he is happy enough to receive for his book or his patent. In replying to this point the other day the President of the Board of Education said it was a simple case, because the income he drew would come under the property tax at the rate of one shilling, and the other part would come under the tax at ninepence. The right hon. Gentleman said—

"If he were paid so much money down for his invention he would naturally have to pay 1s. in the pound, because his invention would

> represent property, and it would come under the property tax. For work done and paid for within the year a man with an income of less than £2,000 a year would have to pay 9d. in the £. When income is derived from accumulated property, and not from something on which a man is working at the time, he pays on the property rate."

Mark the significance of that. No inventor will ever earn anything by his patent. It will not begin to return anything in the year in which he works at it, and the inventor will be told that he has not earned it. I gather from the correspondence I have seen in the papers that whether by the necessities of the case or in consequence of the practice of the publishers, no author ever earns anything in the year in which his book is published, although some authors are fortunate enough to earn something in subsequent years. I understand that no publisher renders an account until six months after publication. I think I am right when I say that the whole of the author's earnings would be treated as unearned for the purposes of the tax. I think it will surprise a great number of people when they find that, under the definition of earnings adopted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a man who writes a book or patents, an invention is not thought to have earned anything which entitles him to come under the lower rate. I maintain, then, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer does not remove the anomalies of the tax. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman is quite correct in assuming that Mr. Gladstone's objection to differentiation was based only on the case of the poor widow. Mr. Gladstone's objections were much deeper and broader; he said you could not make a reasonable or fair distinction. Mr. Gladstone said that by attempting to differentiate they would destroy the tax, and I venture humbly to repeat the statement. If that is true of direct taxes, it is true also of taxes on consumption. Is it not a hardship that the tax on the cheapest qualities of tea is something like 100 per cent. of its value, and that the poorest consumers pay out of all proportion to their richer fellow-citizens? These things are not novel; they have been foreseen by the right hon. Gentleman's predecessors, and because they were foreseen, Lord St. Aldwyn, under whom I served my first apprenticeship at the Treasury, made a serious attempt, under the pressure of a great war, to broaden the basis of taxation. These taxes are sometimes spoken of as war taxes. They are in one sense war taxes, but they were not, in the contemplation of my noble friend, intended to finish with the war. There were certain taxes which he hoped to remit when the war was over. These were the additional duties on Customs and Excise which the present Chancellor of the Exchequer makes permanent; but the sugar, coal, and corn taxes he proposed as a permanent part of our revenue, because, as he impressed on the then House of Commons, the greatest difficulty we had to meet was not to finance the war during its progress, but the future needs of peace which he foresaw in the years which followed. It is therefore no new doctrine I am propounding in saying that we must broaden the basis of taxation, but in so doing we hope to serve other purposes as well. We hope to strengthen our financial system. A financial system which is ample for a Budget of forty or fifty millions is ludicrously inadequate for a Budget of £140,000,000. All of us have present in our minds the great Imperial Conference which has just been sitting in London. Few gatherings have aroused such hopes among the British race through all the King's dominions, or have so concentrated upon themselves the attention of all His Majesty's subjects. What has been the result of all their deliberations? They went smoothly enough in the early days when concessions were asked by one Colonial Minister or Colony of another, but when the time came for us to meet them with concession for concession, then, I am sorry to say, difficulties arose. [AN HON. MEMBER: Were you there?] I was not there, and I am obliged to rely on the inadequate published summaries of the proceedings. For some reason the *précis* writer has not been able to comprehend the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman, or to represent his figures correctly before the public. The figures have been wrongly described on one side or the other in the published summaries, with the result that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has been made to say a thing which was not instead of a thing which was. I am not going to dwell upon that, because we have been promised a full account of the Conference, and we must have a discussion on those Papers when they are presented. Therefore I propose to say very little on this subject indeed, but I cannot pass it by. I should be taunted by hon. Members opposite if I did pass it by. This is a matter to which I cannot be indifferent, and, even if there was no such argument on the basis of taxation as I have hitherto maintained, I should desire to alter our fiscal system in order to reciprocate the commercial offers of our fellow-citizens beyond the seas. The Prime Minister is very angry at the attitude of the Opposition towards the Conference. He complains that we try to make Party capital out of it I am not sure that there was any particular delicacy on the other side in using Colonial opinion when they thought it concurred with their own and would serve their purpose. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's memory requires refreshing. Perhaps he would remember his use of Colonial opinion as to Chinese slavery. But, after all, coming to the solid fact, what have we done? The Prime Minister at Manchester the other day said that the attitude of the Government had been perfectly sympathetic. He told his audience the old story of the man who was moved at a charity meeting by the speeches delivered, and who banged his purse on the Table, declaring "I sympathise £5; how much do you sympathise?" "That," added the Prime Minister, "is after all the true test." Well, judged by the Prime Minister's true test, how much have the Government sympathised? The Government have refused to meet them on the matter of preference even on the existing duties, and almost brutally. The Chancellor of the Exchequer tried to soften his refusal by holding out hopes that in the matter of shipping subsidies he and his colleagues might do something, and the President of the Board of Trade, whose manners are softer, on a later day met them on this point, and gave a gentler but an equally firm refusal to assist them. Again, I ask, judging by the Prime Minister's test, how much do the Government sympathise? We do sympathise, and we are anxious to meet the offers made and not to repel the first united advances towards closer unity which have come from all the King's dominions oversea. We believe that if you create the common affairs and common business which such a policy would establish you would find that the common machinery to guide our common interests and protect them would not be slow to develop itself. No juggling with the income-tax will suffice to distribute wealth in this country. That can only be done by means of wages, and wages are obtained through employment. I lay to the charge of our fiscal system that instead of serving, as it was expected to do, the interests of employment and trade, it acts as a handicap on our industries and commerce. One reason is that it leaves us defenceless against the attacks made upon our commerce by foreign tariffs. We have nothing to bargain with except the wine duties. With the exception of these duties we have practically nothing with which we can negotiate. We are therefore defenceless as negotiators in all tariff concerns. I appeal to hon. Gentleman opposite as business men to give the question a dispassionate and non-Party consideration. What is the most important thing in business success to-day? Surely it is the scale on which you can produce, and the certainty that you can produce on a large scale, as well as the certainty of being able to keep the workshops and the mills running full time. This condition of affairs enables our business men to sell cheap and to undersell competitors—[An HON. MEMBER: That is what we are doing.]—encourages them to expand their trade, and enables them to introduce fresh capital into their business. Germany, with its 60,000,000 of population, has given to its own manufacturers a preferential market, and these manufacturers can reach 40,000,000 of consumers in this country on terms as easy and as light as our own manufacturers reach them. If we look to the manufacturers of America we see that they are encouraged whenever a spurt comes in business to extend their plant, because when a bad time comes and trade is restricted they have at least a preference in their own market, and the knowledge that they have access to ours. Our manufacturers are, on the other hand, hampered. In their home market they have no preference. They have no preference except in Colonial markets. On the ground of the handicap that our manufacturers will suffer from increasingly, I ask for a revision of our present system which, instead of confining our Customs duties to a few high taxes on a few articles of general consumption, should make a general reform in our tariff, and should raise our revenue by duties on manufactured goods, by wider duties on foodstuffs, lower and more moderate than those we have at present, and which will thus enable us not merely to meet the advances of our friends, but to check the inroads of our opponents. That there are difficulties in such a course I do not deny; but hon. Members are here to overcome these difficulties. The wider our fiscal system, the more broadly based it is, the more likely is it to rectify the injustices and the anomalies which now exist, to enlarge the resources of the State without inflicting the hardships which increasing the present taxes would involve, while at the same time providing us with a capacity for expansion in the time of danger or emergency such as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has not got at present, but such as it is necessary the country should possess. I beg to move.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out all the words after the word 'That,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the financial needs of the country, as disclosed in the Budget statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, require that the basis of taxation should be broadened, in order that the anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the the present condition of national and imperial trade."—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I confess that I have some little difficulty in replying to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. In the first place, the terms of the Amendment are not very explicit, and I do not think that any Chancellor of the Exchequer would get much help from it. I looked to the right hon. Gentleman's speech for something in the nature of an outline of the scheme which he would recommend by which a sufficient revenue could be raised to meet current expenditure. The right hon. Gentleman is an ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer; he is accustomed to framing Budgets, and I assumed that he had in his mind some proposals more or less definite in their character which would enable us to understand how he proposed to carry out the ideals which he has before him; but all that the right hon. Gentleman has suggested is wholly insufficient to raise even the present revenue. The right hon. Gentleman proposes to get rid of a large part of the income-tax; he is going to reduce the existing taxes on food stuffs, and is going to replace the loss of revenue by taxation on manufactured goods, in respect of which a preference is to be given to the Colonies. Now, the imports of last year for home consumption of wholly or mainly manufactured goods amounted to £130,000,000, and a tax of 10 per cent., if all the goods still came in, would only produce £13,000,000. The present revenue from income-tax is £32,000,000, and the taxes on food stuffs such as sugar and tea, cannot be less than £12,000,000. I ask him then how this poor paltry hypothetical £13,000,000 could provide for the loss of such a revenue, as well as provide the means for great social reforms and for Colonial preference? The right hon. Gentleman proposes to "broaden the basis of taxation." That is a plausible phrase, which presents to the mind an object obviously desirable in itself. But what is "the basis of taxation?" In this country, and in every other country the only basis of taxation is the taxpayer, and broadening the basis of taxation must therefore mean to bring into the net of the Chancellor of the Exchequer some class of persons who at present escape taxation. But in the United Kingdom we already impose an income-tax on every person with an income of £160, and we tax everyone who consumes beer, wine, spirits, tea, sugar, tobacco. Is there, therefore, anyone with the barest means of livelihood who is not already a taxpayer? "Broadening the basis of taxation" cannot mean the bringing in new classes of taxpayers. The right hon. Gentleman must intend to readjust the burden of taxation as between existing taxpayers. Let us see how the right hon. Gentleman proposes to do that. He proposes to impose new taxes upon a great many people in order to reduce the taxes which now fall on a small number of people. But the larger number are the comparatively poor, and the small number the right hon. Gentleman proposes to relieve are the comparatively rich. The right hon. Gentleman's "broadening the basis of taxation," therefore, can only mean the shifting of the existing burden from the shoulders of the rich on to the shoulders of the poor. On this side of the House we all desire to adjust the burden of taxation according to ability to pay. There may be some difference of opinion as to the proportionate degree of ability to pay of the comparatively poor and comparatively rich; but there is no difference of opinion as to whether the poor are not sufficiently taxed already. We are consequently opposed to any "broadening of the basis of taxation" which can only mean that the poor must pay more and the rich less. The right hon. Gentleman shakes his head; but the poor pay on their tea, their sugar, their beer, spirits, and tobacco. Not content with that, the right hon. Gentleman wishes them to pay also on their furniture, on their clothes, on their boots, on their food, on the wife's bonnet, and on the children's shoes, on their bread, and on their milk and butter, and on everything that they eat, use, or wear. Yet the right hon. Gentleman would not add to the taxation of the poor, but would relieve it, while increasing the revenue, and granting a preference to the Colonies! The right hon. Gentleman says that he knows how to do it, but he has not explained his method of doing it. He began by saying that his intention was not so much to criticise the proposals in the existing Budget, as to point out the need for a complete alteration in our fiscal system. In his speech, it is true, the right hon. Gentleman dealt with one or two matters in regard to the income-tax which are more appropriate to the Committee stage of the Finance Bill, but I will not trouble the House with a discussion of those now. He also criticised the proposal with regard to old age pensions, but that will be dealt with in next year's Budget. The right hon. Gentleman declared that our whole fiscal system must be changed in order to obtain new sources of revenue, and he illustrated his case by referring to the conditions in which we found ourselves in a time of war a few years ago, when the then Chancellor of the Exchequer had to propose "new permanent taxes," on coal, corn, and sugar. The tax on corn was repealed by the late Government, and that on coal was repealed by my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The tax on sugar still remains, but if our revenue proves more elastic no doubt the "permanent" tax on sugar will follow those on corn and coal. The right hon. Gentleman said that our revenue is inelastic. Yes, our revenue has not been as elastic as we would wish to see it. But down to the close of 1905 there was for some years an actual decrease in the weekly wages paid to the working classes. For the first time for four years the average weekly wage increased in 1906; and as that increase is continuing a corresponding elasticity in the revenue would be shown this year and next year from increased consumption. From 1896 to 1901 wages were continuously increasing. From 1901 to 1905 they were continuously decreasing, and only now have we begun a new period of increase. From 1896 to 1900 the revenue showed extraordinary elasticity, and the doubts which the right hon. Gentleman entertained as to the elasticity of the revenue in the future, and on account of which he would change our whole fiscal system are based on grounds not sufficiently examined. The right hon. Gentleman says that our existing means of revenue are not sufficiently continuous to meet our expenditure, and he compared the growth of expenditure with that of ten years ago. Our present expenditure is £140,000,000; but out of that no less than £29,500,000 goes to the fixed debt charge. That is £6,500,000 more than was paid under the late Government before the war. That cannot be regarded as a permanent charge, because as the debt is paid off so rapidly, the fixed debt charge will be gradually, almost automatically, reduced, and we shall have some means for decreasing expenditure and for the purpose of initiating social reforms. Again, out of this £140,000,000 a sum of £2,000,000 goes to pay the interest and annuities on the capital borrowings of the right hon. Gentleman's friends. Altogether, some £8,500,000 more than the late Government provided is devoted by the present Budget for the repayment of debt.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: We always met the annuities year by year;

if the right hon. Gentleman continues to borrow he will have to add to the annuities.

Mr. McKenna: The system of borrowing began in 1894–5 and the amount of annuities then came to only a few thousand pounds a year; but since then we have accumulated Debt to an enormous amount. Consequently while the late Government had to spend a few thousands a year on this service we have to spend millions a year and to go on paying off the debts incurred by right hon. Gentlemen opposite. Therefore, in that respect, the right hon. Gentleman's anticipations of bankruptcy unless we adopt his fiscal system are not quite justified. The right hon. Gentleman went on to speak of our relations with the Colonies. I heard with some astonishment the descriptive account the right hon. Gentleman gave of the Colonial Conference, and I think the Colonial Prime Ministers themselves will be somewhat surprised. The Colonial Prime Ministers did not come here as beggars. They did not come here to ask that the good feeling which they have for us shall be paid for. Their affection towards the mother country is a feeling which we reciprocate, and we no more ask them to pay for our good feeling towards them than they ask us to pay for their good feeling towards us. They came to us—some of them, at least, not all—and made a proposition which they regarded, from their point of view, as a business proposal; but there was no brutal refusal on our part. The reply made to the Colonial Prime Ministers was of a nature, I think, that even the most susceptible of them must have considered could not have been dictated by anything but good feeling towards them and a proper regard for the welfare of this country. The right hon, Gentleman has failed, if I may say so, to appreciate the fundamental difference between the colonial position and ours. The Colonies tax for two purposes—for the purpose of revenue and for the regulation of trade. We tax only for the purpose of revenue. When the Colonies offer us fiscal advantages by way of preference, it would be wholly inconsistent with our principles of taxation to accept them, and they offer them in such a way as neither to interfere with their revenue nor with the protection of their own manufactories. But if we, who did not tax for the regulation of trade, adopted their system of preference, we should have to introduce a new principle into our fiscal system, and we must depart from our present system of taxation. We represent the majority in this country and that majority believes that taxation for the regulation of trade will be bad for us. They believe that any advantages which individual manufacturers may obtain will be too dearly bought, and that our gigantic interests, built up as they are now upon a free-trade basis, will be far more injured than the interests of any other people in the world by any alteration of our existing fiscal system. The right hon. Gentleman seems to forget what is a fundamental fact in trade. We all know, by observation of foreign countries, that, under protection, they get great vested interests which have grown up under that fiscal system. It is quite true that we get great vested interests which have grown up under free trade; but those vested interests in this country are the most important and the most profitable in our industry. Take, for instance, the shipping trade. The shipping trade is dependent for its very existence in its present proportions upon the freedom of trade and the freedom from tariff. I go further, and say that not only our trade, but our very existence as an Empire depends on the strength of our mercantile power. If you attack free trade, if you ask us to alter our fiscal system in order that we may give a benefit in our markets to the Colonies, we shall injure great interests, like the shipping interest, which have grown up under free trade.

Mr. Austen Chamberlain: In what way? Surely our shipping trade was founded and established, primarily, under the old mercantile system.

Mr. McKenna: Under the old maritime laws of the nations of the world we had a shipping trade, it is true, but by no means a proponderating shipping trade. We have to-day a shipping trade which exceeds the shipping trade of all the rest of the world put together, and that shipping trade, I contend, has grown to its present size and importance under the influence of free trade. When some of the Colonial Premiers asked us to make a change in our fiscal system, the House will agree that we were bound to consider what would be the effect of that change upon our trade as a whole. They told us that they believed that adopting a system of Colonial preference would draw the bonds of the Empire more strongly together. Yes, provided it is not at too dear a price. What can be more calculated to draw the bonds of Empire together than that we should have free trade within the Empire—free trade within the Empire and protection against the outside world? We said that, but did the Colonies say that? Not at all. Let the right hon. Gentleman opposite propose to Mr. Deakin to have free trade with this country and see what his reply would be. He would say, "Oh, no. The great advantages of commercial union or commercial preference would be too dearly bought," and he would add, "We will consider that proposition when our population is as big as yours." We say that the Imperial advantages of Colonial preference may be too dearly bought when our population is forty millions and theirs is four millions. The argument upon which they reject free trade is exactly the same argument upon which we reject Colonial preference. The good feeling between the Colonies and ourselves is not to be disturbed so easily as the right hon. Gentleman thinks. After all, the sentiment which has grown up has grown up under the present fiscal system. It is a very remarkable thing, but it is the fact, that the whole change of Colonial sentiment towards the mother country which took place during the latter half of last century exactly coincided with the time when we had free markets in this country, when we had enormously increased, as I say in consequence of those free markets, our shipping, and therefore our intercourse with the Colonies, and had been content to leave the Colonies absolutely alone to govern themselves, whether politically or fiscally, as they pleased. I am sure that the good sentiment which has grown up under these conditions is much more likely to survive if we leave them unchanged than if we begin to tie round our Colonies hampering and fettering bonds, and if we introduce the haggling of the market-place into the relations of good feeling which exist between us and the Colonies. I hope that the visit of the Colonial Premiers will not be treated in the Colonies as it will be treated if the words of the right hon. Gentleman are listened to. I cannot help regretting that, whether it is on the grounds of prejudice, or from motives of making political capital, hon. Gentlemen opposite should in public and in this House endeavour to instil into the minds of the Colonies the notion that the majority of the people of this country—and, after all, the majority support the Liberal Government—are not friendly to them. That is an absolutely mistaken notion, and as it has been the consistent policy of the Liberal Party during the last century to favour the growth and development and independence within the Empire of the Colonies, so it will be the policy of the Liberal Party in the present century.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) said he could not pretend that he was in the least convinced by the speech of the President of the Board of Education. The right hon. Gentleman had endeavoured to prove that this Budget was a perfect Budget. He, on the contrary, remained of the opinion that it was far from meeting the necessities of the case, and that the right hon. Gentleman's speech, and that of the Chancellor of Exchequer earlier, rather exposed the deadlock and the absolute nakedness of the land to which the present financial position of the Government had brought the country. This Budget did not broaden the basis of taxation. On the contrary, it showed, to his mind, an inelastic helplessness. When the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down spoke of the possibility of elasticity of revenue in the future he did not know on what ground he based his opinion. They were always hearing of the splendid Board of Trade Returns, but yet there was now to be it appeared a continuous income-tax of 1s. in the pound; and no prospect of altering that state of things was apparent, though any future scheme of old age pensions could not but enormously increase the demands upon the Exchequer. If a sudden strain was put on, the whole system would snap, and we should find ourselves in great difficulty. Colonial preference, on the other hand, would encourage Colonial food supply in time of war or emergency, but the Government scheme of taxation really handicapped our very existence.

The right hon. Gentleman had twitted them with the fact that they were not pretending to put forward a broadening of the basis of taxation by the Amendment, but what the Amendment asked was, as a general proposition, that the basis of taxation should be broadened in order that revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform might be raised with fairness to all classes of the community. And why could it not be broadened both with a view of extending taxation to more articles and by way of bringing foreigners within its area? He did not see why it could not be so broadened as to compel foreigners to contribute to a larger extent to the taxation of this country. The right hon. Gentleman did not mention that. He did not know why. The right hon. Gentleman had talked about the undue burden of taxation put upon the poor, but he might remind him that while the Chancellor of the Exchequer was laying more taxes on the few he had not lightened the burden on the many, that while he was relieving the middle classes he was putting a tax on the dividends, as unearned income, of the savings which had been effected for the widow and her children. Did hon. Gentlemen really consider that the proposals made for retaining trades in this country by alteration of the tariff were or were not a breach of free trade? He heard the other day a gentleman who was fully qualified to speak for free importers say that whether duties were or were not protection depended on whether or not the extra amount paid by the purchaser went into the national treasure. Was a whole trade a national treasure? If duties were put on to retain a trade in this country were they protection or not? He said they were not. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, he believed, said they were. Let them take a case which he had recently come across in a factory which he knew. A certain metal fitting was produced there, of which the cost of manufacture was 2¾d. and the market price 3¼d. or 3½d. It was always cheaper to produce on a big scale than on a small one; and Germany could produce on a big scale as she had access to our markets as well as her own since we had no tariff to prevent her; while we could only produce on a smaller and dearer scale because though we had our own market to sell in, Germany kept us carefully out of hers by high tariff walls. Accordingly, she had been able to flood this country with this particular fitting at 2¼d. a piece, a price which just about represented the mere cost of the metal used. The British manufacturer in consequence had been obliged to cease manufacturing that fitting, and had discharged a number of men, and now bought the fitting from Germany to sell at a profit. The result was that the work was done by German workmen, the fitting was sold by the manufacturer at a profit, and the only people seriously injured were the British workmen the manufacturer was compelled to discharge. If we put on a duty to prevent a trade being throttled in this way in this country, was it protection or not? If hon. Members thought it was, he could only say he thought their views were entirely against the original doctrine of free trade. He thought it used to be admitted that it was perfectly desirable under the old free trade doctrine to put a duty on an article rather than to allow the industry to be killed by foreign competition. No wonder capitalists said that had they to start again in business they would not build a factory, but take an office, and buy articles from abroad to sell at a profit to themselves. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of Imperial trade and the question of preferential trade dealt with at the Colonial Conference. He would like to point out one or two difficulties that would arise if the attitude of the Government in slamming the door against Colonial preference was consistently maintained. It was perfectly well known that Canada proposed to introduce a general tariff to be employed against foreign nations who would give her no advantage, an intermediate tariff which was open to nations who would bargain with her, and a preferential tariff to British goods. But in so far as bargains were made between Canada and foreign countries, by so much would British preference be prejudiced. And local districts would be affected. For instance, Lancashire and Yorkshire which were accounted as main centres of free trade, had an enormous trade in cottons. If Canada were to bargain, for example, with Italy, which had lately built a number of mills for the manufacture of cheap cottons, and give her the benefit of the intermediate tariff for these cottons, Lancashire and Yorkshire would suffer to the extent that the British preference was reduced. And the greater the time that elapsed before we came to an arrangement on this basis of business with our Colonies the less likely were we to get good terms for our own manufactures. The right hon. Gentleman talked of Colonial preferences as fettering bonds, and at the Colonial Conference the Government stated that preference would merely be the means of fomenting quarrels between the Colonies and the mother country. Had the Government considered whether if Canada asked for or obtained a bargain with a foreign country which was refused by this country, that would not raise feeling both here and in Canada, which might result in strained or even dangerous consequences? He did not think it would be wise to look on while such an arrangement was being come to between Canada and foreign countries under the delusion that no harm would happen to us. It was, he believed, supposed in some fiscal schools that no harm could arise because a negotiation of that kind by Canada was always subject to revision by the Crown. But did hon. Members suppose that such matter as that could be held back for revision by the Crown without great friction and disturbance? In theory revision might be quite possible, but hon. Gentlemen who supposed that kind of thing was likely to occur, and still more, occur effectually, would seem to have forgotten the whole reasons of the United States War of Independence. Large States which knew what they wanted and knew their obligations and responsibilities were not likely to allow their bargains to be put on one side and gratuitously shelved by the mother country. Why should the mother country be left out in the cold if the Colonies were to establish preference among themselves? The Colonies were satisfied that it was of advantage to themselves and to the mother country. Why, then, should we throw cold water on it and remain outside the scheme? He did not think that showed the affection for the Colonies which all in this country felt and which all desired to show. If preference was against all the theory of free trade, why did the Government allow Bechuanaland and Basutoland under the dominion of the Colonial Office to give preferential treatment to British goods? The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said recently that no advocate of preference had answered the question of how they proposed to give effective preference to South Africa when South Africa only produced wool and hides, which, being raw materials, they did not propose to touch. Had he interrupted the right hon. Gentleman at the time, which he did not because he thought that a perfunctory answer would have been misleading, he would have mentioned South African wines. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] Hon. Members laughed at South African wines, but it was only on wines that the South African Colonies asked for a preference, and a generation or two back South African wines were very much in fashion in this country. The whole of that trade was got by the preference then given. But the subject was a great deal more far-reaching, and he thought that the question which the Chancellor of the Exchequer put seemed to show clearly that he did not quite appreciate the very broad policy which they considered Colonial preference really was. They were not seeking for mathematical accuracy in the preferences between the Colonies. That was not what the Colonies themselves were seeking. They did not want a uniform scheme between one Colony and another, or between the mother country and the Colonies. They were content if gains were sufficiently in the ascendant. The question was one really not of statics but of dynamics. The object of preference was really to develop normal industries. In the case of South Africa he would suggest that the tobacco trade was a normal industry which might be developed. The object of Colonial preference was to develop, with great emphasis on the word, the normal industries of various Colonies, and to stimulate those activities most conducive to our position there. Each constituent State of the Empire, he submitted, would work out its own tariff in its own interest, and then offer it to other Colonies and other States. They were free to accept it or not. What appeared a very small preference at the present time might appear a very large one in the future. If they appealed, as he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer did, to the Board of Trade figures to show that the preferences which would be granted were very small, his answer was that the Board of Trade figures, as they existed, however accurate, were not a true guide to the advantages of preference, because they could not measure by them the potential development of new industries which preference would encourage. That was the whole intention of their policy of Colonial preference; it was a creed, it opened out as part of a broad political philosophy. They advocated State action for combining the Empire, as Mr. Deakin had said, for Imperial co-operation in peace as well as in war. In the Conference the Colonial Premiers might have made little recorded advance on the resolutions of 1902; but in the country they had, he ventured to say, broken the back of unreasoning Cobdenism; and if hon. Gentlemen opposite could only realise the untold possibilities of developing trade that would come from Colonial preference, the great increase of friendship, and communication, and mutual understanding that would arise between ourselves and our Colonies, the importance that such a consummation would have in regard to Imperial unity and co-operation in peace as well as in war, he did not believe that they would any longer oppose this policy, but that they would support it, as the Opposition did, with the determined intention and confident belief that before long it would be realised.

*MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars) said those for whom he spoke were entirely with the Government in the reply that had been made to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire. They wanted closer relationship with the Colonies as much as anyone, but they believed with the Government that anything which was done in the way of tightening the bands of the Empire, or of increasing the revenues of this country, must be done on the basis of free trade. They wanted to be friendly with the Colonies, because they had faith in their free political institutions; and they had so much pride in the fortunes of their countrymen abroad that they naturally wanted to see them prosper. Moreover, as workmen, and representatives of workmen, they wanted the fullest possible outlet for the labour and enterprise of their own countrymen, and therefore they were all interested in seeing the Colonies prosper and in their having the closest relationship with us. But there was the old Scottish adage, which might be commended to the consideration of their Colonial brethren, and it was this, "If you want to make friends you must be friendly." It seemed to him a curious way of making friends that our Colonies should impose tariffs on our goods. There was nothing to prevent the fullest possible freedom of exchange of goods between ourselves and the Colonies, as far as he knew, on our side. He agreed with the President of the Board of Education that the best way to develope our commercial relations with the Colonies was that goods should be taken freely as between them and the mother-country. It was quite true that we could set up preference for the Colonies if, in the first place, we imposed a tariff on food stuffs; but for his part he was not disposed to increase the price of food and to increase the difficulty of living among our people here for the purpose of increasing our friendship with the Colonies. The interests of labour, social reform, the readjustment of the burdens of taxation, which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire deplored as pressing so heavily on some members of the community—all these things were to be achieved, if at all, on the basis of free trade rather than upon the proposals put forward by the mover of the Amendment. He must repeat the oft-told tale as to old age pensions, because they deplored that something had not been attempted as well as promised in regard to that matter. This theme had fired the imagination of the people, and had enabled politicians, especially Labour politicians, to get the ear of the electors and to be returned to Parliament. He had a Return ordered by the House of Commons at the instance of Mr. Burt, in 1903, entitled "Boards of Guardians. Persons in receipt of relief." It included a great many figures, and went to show that poverty in old age was a permanent feature of our social life—

> "It appears that the proportion of paupers over sixty-five years of age has not varied much, though it has risen since the 1st of January, 1892, and that the proportion of paupers over sixty-five years of age to the estimated number of persons in England and

Wales over that age on the respective dates has remained almost the same. The total number of paupers over sixty-five years of age has on each date formed more than half the total number of paupers over sixteen years of age. The table shows that a larger proportion of the total number of aged paupers have been relieved by admission to workhouses and infirmaries on each succeeding date."

He thought they were all agreed as to the problem and as to the remedy, which was a system of pension upon a non-contributory basis. The junior Member for the City of London had said there were 5,000 pensioners on the funds of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers' trade union organisation, and he put it to the House that what had been accomplished in that way could also be done by everybody else, and in that way the pension question could be solved. He differed from the hon. Baronet in that respect. It was true that the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, of which he was proud to be chief officer, had been able to provide for 5,000 pensions in that way, and the reason was that they had been able through trade unions to wrest from capital a little over and above the average requirements of the workpeople. But this could not apply to such people as agricultural labourers and the poor women workers in mills and factories, and other people engaged in the sweated industries. To talk of such people saving up for their old age through any system of mutual help or individual thrift was discreditable to the heart as well as to the head of those who made such a statement. Upon this question, where he differed with the Government was in regard to the urgency of the problem. In his opinion the provision of old age pensions was infinitely more important than giving relief to men with incomes up to £2,000 a year. They had had in the past a great many promises with regard to old age pensions. Such pensions formed the chief item in the programme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in 1895. He did not wish to go back so far, and he would content himself with reminding hon. Members of what took place only three months ago when it fell to his lot to propose an Amendment to the King's Speech, regretting that no provision had been made for old age pensions this year. On that occasion he made a forecast as to the amount of funds which would be at the disposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he urged the Government not to go in for retrenchment without reform, and not to relieve the income-tax payer in preference to a fair consideration of the old and needy. He reminded the Government on that occasion of the thousands of speeches made by hon Gentlemen opposite before they were elected, and he told them that if they did not consider this subject they would belie all those speeches. The Chancellor of the Exchequer at once hastened to assure them, on behalf of the Government, of his entire sympathy with the objects he had described, and the Labour Members in their simplicity took the right hon. Gentleman to mean that he meant business. Consequently they withdrew the Amendment and refrained from voting in the subsequent division which was claimed by hon. Gentlemen above the Gangway. Now they found that the Budget was by no means different in its essentials from the Budgets which had been introduced for the last twenty years. Stripped of its embellishments what did the Budget mean? It simply gave to those who had, and took away the hope which was the all of many an old man and woman who had been looking forward to these pensions. He was opposed to relieving the income-tax payer until old age pensions had been provided. If any relief had to be given it most certainly should have been given to those who were suffering from the sugar tax, and to the poor people who consumed sugar. The free breakfast table had again been relegated to the dim and distant future, and the poor old folk would have to go to their graves with the hope "deferred that maketh the heart sick," in order that the man with £2,000 a year might be relieved of a contribution which would in each case have provided two old age pensions upon the scale they were asking for them. He was aware it had been stated that a definite promise had been made that something would be done next year. Personally he would rather have the sparrow in the hand than the bird of Paradise in the land of promise. He would much rather have had the £2,000,000 which had been thrown away in relieving the income-tax payer, and as much more as they could get, this year, instead of waiting until the dim and distant future. This Budget was a mere pandering to the City clerk and the small gentry who thought themselves superior persons, and took their politics from the *Daily Mail.* He believed this scheme would fail, the *Daily Mail* would start another hare, and nothing would be gained by the Government, who might just as well devoted that £2,000,000 to a good democratic purpose. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was relying upon further economies next year through a better system of income-tax collection and other things, and in that way he hoped to have funds to be able to start with old age pensions. But what would happen if those things did not come off? He would remind the House that already £650,000 had been taken for another purpose. He was afraid that the poor old men and women who had been looking forward hopefully would next year again be disappointed and have to go short. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made his announcement by saying that that would be the policy of the Government "if they were allowed to have their way," and, he said, that was a very big "if." He would like to know who was going to stop them having their way. They had a majority which consisted for the most part of hon. Gentlemen who were willing and anxious to give them all the support necessary to carry out this long-promised reform, and if the Government did not have their own way in the matter there would be nobody to blame but themselves. The promise of a start next year really carried but little consolation to his mind. There had been in the past promises of a far more definite character which to this day remained unfulfilled. On the 19th February last year they were promised in the most definite manner possible in the King's Speech an Amendment to the Unemployed Workmen's Act. Five months after that the same promise was repeated through the mouth of the President of the Local Government Board, and they were now just as far off realising that promise as ever they were. Consequently, these promises carried with them very little consolation. A good deal of revenue had been sacrificed to improve the national credit, but he thought the same results might have been achieved by the inauguration of some system of old age pensions, because it was well known that if they increased the purchasing power of the working classes they at the same time increased their economic effectiveness, and greased the wheels of industry and benefited all round. Those for whom he spoke were profoundly discontented and dissatisfied because nothing had yet been done to carry out those promises, in regard to the question of old age pensions, which had been made by politicians on both sides of the House, as the result of which high hopes had been entertained. He hoped that the pressure would be kept up this year, and that the Government would at the earliest possible moment make a really good start in earnest to carry this reform into effect. How to raise the money was a matter which rested primarily with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was aware that it was a very big task, but he knew that it was not going to be solved by tinkering with such quack remedies as those which had been proposed from hon. Members sitting above the gangway. He honestly believed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had the means at his disposal to accomplish this reform quite consistently with the great principles of free trade. He wished to dissociate himself from the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Wirral on Friday last in reference to the income-tax, when he said that he believed the money could be raised by an income-tax which should start right at the bottom and go on in an increasing ratio right up to the top. He was not in favour of imposing an income-tax upon a man with £1 a week, because the State had no right to tax any man until the means at his disposal were sufficient to allow him to live in health and comfort. A man with £1 a week could not live that life. Therefore he was not in favour of that way of collecting the tax. Nor was he in favour of imposing additional burdens on the local authority for this purpose. It seemed to him that there were many poor localities where the people were in need of old age pensions, which had sufficient burdens to bear at the present moment without increasing them to the extent of 10 per cent. It seemed to him that the most hopeful method of getting the money was by taxing the wealth of the country—taxing those people who received large sums of money which he believed were social in their origin and therefore ought to be taxed for social purposes. There were 275,000 people in this country who, according to the hon. Member for North Paddington, took one-third of the national income. A tax of 5 per cent. might be taken from those incomes, or they might graduate the tax in such a way as to take most from those who were at the top. There were 750,000 people with over £700 a year, and a tax of 5 per cent. in their case would realise £29,000,000, a sum sufficient to provide for old age pensions, for a better system of education, and for carrying out a great many other reforms which were ardently desired by himself and his friends. They were told that 16,000 people in the country had incomes of over £5,000 a year. That amounted to £200,000,000 every year, and here again a tax of 5 per cent. could raise something like £20,000,000 a year, a sum more than sufficient, taking into consideration the economies that might be effected in Poor Law administration, to provide the old age pensions they were pleading for. These were one or two of the directions in which money could be obtained, and in which new sources of revenue of a more sensible and scientific character could be tapped, than those urged from the Benches above the gangway. He and his friends hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would open his heart and yet induce the Government to do something at an earlier date than he mentioned in introducing the Budget in order to give effect to the many promises made on this question and to inaugurate a system of old age pensions which would relieve those people who had been looking forward so hopefully to the Budget and also take away from this rich and powerful country the stigma of leaving its aged veterans to taper off their lives in the shadow of the workhouse.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) said he was not astonished that the late Chancellor of the Exchequer should have moved this Amendment. He could not resist the opinion that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had almost invited it. For, after nearly two years of office and in times of unprecedented prosperity, he came before the House and said, "Here am I, a great free trade Chancellor, representing a Government pledged to the dual policy of maintaining the national credit and of promoting social reform, obliged to admit at the outset that the penny I took off tea last year has done no good to anyone, and that it is impossible to-day to make any further concessions off any of the food taxes—tea, sugar, coffee, cocoa, and other articles of food must still bear their heavy burdens. All I can do it to make some slight modification of the income-tax in favour of people with incomes under £2,000 a year; whilst as regards old age pensions, to which I am pledged up to the hilt, the utmost I can do is," and here he would draw the special attention of the Labour Party to the Chancellor's words when introducing his Budget—

> "to begin to provide the nucleus of a fund,"

and

> "to lay firm the foundations of this reform—"

language about as vague as any Minister could possibly use, and as subtle as that which the Chancellor adopted when he proclaimed himself an enemy, in times of peace, of a uniform income-tax at the rate of 1s. in the £. That little word "uniform" possessed virtue which few people suspected at the time. Looking at the Amendment, as it stood upon the Paper, he was not sure that he ought not to vote for it. It simply suggested that the basis of taxation should be broadened in order that certain burdens at present pressing upon the community might be more equitably adjusted and lightened. He remembered Lord Brampton, when Mr. Justice Hawkins, once telling him that he was frequently convinced of the innocence of a prisoner until he heard his defence. And so, when they were asked to read into those words the particular meaning ascribed to them by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, it was with reluctance that he turned away from the Amendment, and asked himself whether, within the limits of our present fiscal system, it was possible to accomplish the objects to which the Chancellor and his Government were pledged. At any rate, he proposed to offer certain suggestions to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the hope that when he made his next Budget speech, he would have found some better solution of the difficulty than the hazardous proposals of the Party opposite. He would not, however, be content if, in a year's time, the right hon. Gentleman was still unable to do more than 'begin to provide the nucleus of a fund.' That was far too remote an achievement. The right hon. Gentleman might just as well speak about beginning to produce a protoplasm and then claim that he had brought into being a fully developed human creature in all the glory of robust manhood. What had the Chancellor of the Exchequer done in regard to this important reform of old age pensions? He had taken £1,500,000 off his estimated surplus, and ear-marked it, so he told them, as the nucleus of the fund. But where was it? As a matter of fact he had placed it to the credit of the New Sinking Fund, and he asked how was it to be got back without special legislation? Suppose in the meantime it had been spent? What about the £600,000 it was proposed to hand over to Ireland in connection with the Devolution Bill? And who knew what other special demands, unforseen by the Chancellor to-day, might arise during the financial year? Then there was to be £750,000 uncollected balance from the income-tax making with the £1,500,000, if they got it, a total sum of £2,250,000 as the 'firm foundation of this reform.' They had been told again and again on behalf of the Government that a system of old age pensions of 5s. per week to every person of sixty-five years and upwards would require a sum of at least £28,000,000. He did not agree with the figure, and he would endeavour in a moment to show that it was grossly exaggerated, but assuming it for the moment to be correct, it followed that all the Chancellor of the Exchequer could say was that under the present system of taxation the very best he could do towards an old-age pension system was that if he spent the whole capital and got the same sum every year the amount he gave, namely £2,250,000, would just give 4¾d. per week for every person over sixty-five years of age.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I have not said so.

MR. BOTTOMLEY said the right hon. Gentleman very properly corrected him and said that he had not even promised that. He was only drawing the inference that with £2,250,000 in hand, and that being the only sum which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had earmarked for the purpose, it was only equivalent to 4¾d. a week. If they treated it as a capital sum, it came only to a farthing per week for every person over sixty-five years of age. The point he wished to put before the House was that they had been very much misled in regard to the language used on this problem. It had been said again and again that £28,000,000 or £29,000,000 was necessary. According to the President of the Local Government Board he at present spent £10,000,000 a year on the maintenance of paupers and criminal lunatics. These people, who were at present maintained at the expense of the State, would have to be maintained whether there were old-age pensions or not, and therefore they were entitled to deduct £10,000,000 from the £28,000,000. [Cries of "No, no."]

*MR. JOHN BURNS said that the cost of maintaining paupers, and pauper lunatics in the United Kingdom was £16,500,000. The £10,000,000 to which the hon. Member referred were applied to a different condition of things—to granting pensions to 200,000 members of the Army, Navy and Civil Services.

MR. BOTTOMLEY said that even so, a sum of at least £8,000,000 might be reduced from the £28,000,000 or £29,000,000 which were required for an old age pension scheme at the age of sixty-five years. Then it had been assumed that everyone in the country at the age of sixty-five would claim the pension; but his belief was that an enormous number of people would not do so. He did not approve of the proposal that people should have to attend at their town hall and wait outside the door like a theatre queue for their pensions, but he did suggest that under any scheme they should at least have to make some application for the pension, and it was certain that a very large percentage would not do so. Taking all these considerations together, he had come to the conclusion that £12,000,000 is the outside sum which would be required for a scheme of 5s. per week at the age of sixty-five. He suggested that there were one or two sources open to the Chancellor of the Exchequer without adopting those suggested by the right hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment. He had always been of opinion that a tax of a penny in the pound should be imposed on all employers on the wages which they paid. That would be a tax easily collectable, and would produce a sum of nearly £5,000,000 a year. It was ridiculous to suggest that large employers of labour, say with 5,000 men or more in their workshops, would be crippled by such a tax. The income of this country divided itself automatically into sections. It amounted to £2,000,000,000—£1,000,000,000 was derived from profits in trade in the United Kingdon, and £1,000,000,000 from investments abroad; and 1d. in the £ on these latter would bring in £5,000,000 a year; and it would not press hardly on any section of the community. There never had been a more futile reason urged against a complete system of graduation or differentiation of the income-tax than that advanced—that they should not overwork a Government Department! The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that his object was to maintain the national credit and to provide means for carrying out social reforms. But the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the chief difficulty was that they could not get people to declare truly what their income was. He could not help thinking that that was a sorry confession to make after fifty years of simple Bible teaching; and that they could not trust Bishops, Judges or even Cabinet Ministers to set out in a return the truth as to the amount of their income. He suggested that every member of the community should be bound to disclose his income. At present we had nominally, although by no means actually, an income-tax of 1s. in the £, or 5 per cent. If this tax were equitably adjusted so as to produce its full yield, taking the national income at £2,000,000,000 per year, the present income-tax should produce £100,000,000 instead of £30,000,000. His suggestion was that 5 per cent. should be reduced to 2½, or 6d. in the £, and that it should be so graduated as ultimately to yield the amount, which would mean a net revenue of £50,000,000 against the present £30,000,000, or again of £20,000,000 per year. There alone they would have a surplus much more than sufficient to provide the old age pension fund. He suggested that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should sometimes take into his confidence and counsel business men who could indicate to him how large sums which at present eluded the vigilance of his officials could be gathered in. It was indisputable among business circles in the City of London that from £2,000,000 to £3,000,000 per annum were lost to the revenue from investments abroad. He heard a gentleman in the City the other day declare that every farthing of his company's fund was invested abroad, although they looked to the English Government to protect their interests. There were, he thought, methods by which, without great ingenuity, the profits on those investments abroad could be taxed. He did not know whether it would violate copy-book text-books, but his opinion was that the incomes derived from foreign investments should be taxed higher than those derived from home investments. Such a tax would bring in at least £2,000,000 a year under a proper revision of the income-tax. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had hinted at a tax on motor-cars; that the running of motor-cars was not only a luxury but a luxury with a tendency to degenerate into a nuisance. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman, and he thought that it would have been quite possible without waiting to re-adjust the Local Taxation Account to tax motor-cars. Again, an enormous revenue might be gathered from a tax on advertisements, as in France. That would be no tax on knowledge; and would not be grudged by advertisers, large or small. Another source of income would be a tax on theatre tickets, as in France. It could be easily collected. Then, an enormous income was derived in France from racing. Some hon. Gentlemen were shocked at such a proposal, although they were quite complaisant about the still greater revenue derived in this country from the drink traffic. They held up their hands in holy horror at the idea of the State deriving a revenue from betting and horse-racing as a State recognition of a great vice. That reminded him of the Roman Emperor who was rebuked for having derived a tax from some tainted source and who took a handful of the money and smelt it, and said "*non olet*——." If, having established the principle of reaping £30,000,000 a year from the drink traffic, was there not stupidity in refusing to reap a revenue from betting and racing? He had put a question to the Home Secretary that day, in which he had asked whether the attendances at racecourses since the Street Betting Bill had been passed had not enormously increased, and the right hon. Gentleman admitted that it was so. As a matter of fact there was no standing out against the betting and gambling instincts of mankind, although the evils of gambling were fearfully exaggerated. Millions of money were, however, turned over every year in connection with betting in one form or another, and if the Government would only take its courage in both hands, and say, as they said with regard to the drink traffic, "We will tax the gambling habits of the people, and, by so doing, regulate them as we cannot do at present," they might derive from such a system a revenue of between two and three millions a year. He knew that the idea, like all great ideas, would take two or three years to develop; but after the next general election they might have a more level-headed man at the head of affairs, who would see that he could make two or three millions a year out of horse-racing, and who would be willing to garner it in to the credit of the State. It was a strange and amazing thing that this, the richest country in the world, with the largest credit in the world, was unable to provide its aged people with the decencies of humanity and the ordinary comforts of life. Whatever the hon. Member for Preston or the hon. Member for the City of London might say, he did not think that was a proper state of things. As to the hon. Member for the City of London, he had no constituents who were interested in this matter, except a few asthmatical housekeepers; so that he could afford to sneer at the workers of the country. He was unable to understand the position which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken up. They had waited patiently for nearly two years, and personally he was prepared to wait another year, to give him the fullest opportunity of considering whether, and without the violent disruption of our fiscal system which the late Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed, it was possible to carry out the Government's policy of national credit and social reform. If when the time came he had made no further progress, he confessed he would listen with a more sympathetic ear than he did to-day to the voice of the charmer on the Front Opposition Bench. He did not appreciate the national credit which said that the greatest and richest country on earth was unable to provide the funds for admittedly urgent social needs. We had long since acknowledged the principle that it was the duty of the State to protect its young, and despite all doctrinaire objections, we now recognised a similar obligation towards the old. A revolution in our fiscal policy was an enormous risk to take, but he would almost rather face it than be forced to admit such utter helplessness and despair as that which characterised this year's Budget. Whilst he would vote for the Second Reading of this Bill, he would do so with the fullest reservation of his freedom next year to reconsider the position if a brilliant and able Free Trade Chancellor, such as they had today, again came forward and told them, with all the responsibility of his knowledge and his position, that wealthy England was unable, without the indignities of the Poor Law and the gloom of workhouse, to provide its aged and helpless poor with the decencies of civilisation and the primary comforts of humanity.

*MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): I do not wish to follow the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken in the numerous and ingenious suggestions he has made, but I think we may fairly claim that after his remarks he should vote for the Amendment and against the Government of which he is supposed to be one of the supporters. I do not think anyone can doubt that, during the last three weeks, the principles that lie at the base of this Amendment have received very great and remarkable stimulus. We shall all agree that the revenue of the country should be equitably raised, and that it should interfere as little as possible with the processes of production. The Members on this side of the House also maintain that in raising that revenue the interests of the Empire as a whole, as well as those of the United Kingdom, should be considered. That principle has received during the last few months remarkable corroboration at the hands of the Government. The Minister who is responsible in this House for Colonial affairs has welcomed with the utmost cordiality the forging between the Colonies of those very bonds which have, in another connection, been described as "squalid."

The President of the Board of Trade is reported to have said at the Colonial Conference that the Empire would be a great gainer if much that was now bought from foreign countries could be produced and purchased within the Empire. The right hon. Gentleman acknowledged the advantage conferred on the British manufacturer by the existing Colonial preference, and expressed gratitude for the spirit of comradeship and affection which inspired that policy. These admissions show a great advance in opinion on the Ministerial side of the House. The basis of taxation needs widening, not in the sense referred to by the Minister for Education, but in the sense of bringing a greater number of commodities under taxation. I wish to appeal to orthodox free traders on this point. Is it or is it not contrary to the old free-trade doctrine to bring an additional number of commodities under taxation? Fifty or sixty years ago Mr. Gladstone, when taking off a great number of duties, spoke of the enormous burden resting on the taxpayer, and expressed a doubt, in view of the magnitude of the national expenditure, whether the proposals he was making could long be maintained. Hon. Gentlemen opposite will recognise the authority in this matter of Sir George Cornewall Lewis, who said that if he were to define a good system of taxation it would be a system bearing lightly on a great number of points and heavily on none.

MR. ASQUITH: What was the date?

*MR. LYTTELTON: That was in 1857. To keep the taxes on existing commodities in their present state and impose more would, I agree, be to tax the poor more heavily; but the case would be different if we lessen those taxes somewhat, brought a greater number of commodities into the area of taxation, and diffused the burden. The advantage of this would be great, but we should, as an additional advantage, have the opportunity of introducing the principle of Colonial preference. I cannot help thinking that the attitude taken up by the Government at the conference and in the House of Commons to-night is really based on the dogma which has existed for some sixty years in England, which lays down that if ever a tax on a commodity coming into this country though imposed for revenue only should benefit a producer of the commodity in this country, then you must have a countervailing excise, or the tax is unsound. You must tax for revenue only. Is that principle based on any consideration of human nature? If it was claimed that it was, I should deny it entirely. Suppose I have to pay a tax on an article, should I pay it the less because one of my neighbours was going to be benefited by the fact that I paid it? Surely not. Take the tax on tobacco, a commodity on which we pay the appalling tax of 500 per cent. Should I pay it with more reluctance because I knew that some of my hon. friends from Ireland were going to get some benefit out of it for the Irish tobacco growing industry? I do not believe in the truth of the consideration of human nature in the least. It seems to me to be on a par with an argument greatly used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in introducing his Budget, namely, that every taxpayer expects the exact mathematical burden of a tax to rest on his shoulders equally with the rest of the community. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in objecting to Colonial preference, said it is impossible to tax all members of the Empire with exact mathematical accuracy.

MR. ASQUITH: I have never advocated exact mathematical accuracy. I said you cannot do it—you cannot come to anything like even remote approximation to accuracy.

*MR. LYTTELTON: Of course, I accept the correction; but I say that my right hon. friend's corrected statement is equally unsound. The Colonists are practical men. They know the conditions of their own Colonies, and of this country. They are not so utterly unreasonable as to suppose that all those conditions can be equated, and they would be perfectly ready to accept an advantage, even though the advantage be less to some than to others. I say, therefore, that this dogma, which has hung round the neck of the fiscal system of this country for fifty years, is not based on human nature; it is based not on real human nature, but on a fiction which the Treasury tells us is human nature. I put it again to the House that, if anyone pays a tax, the circumstance that some of the payer's neighbours get a little advantage over his foreign competitors out of the payment, so far from causing anxiety, will give him nothing but pleasure. If that is so, surely also the fact that the levying of a tax enables the Government which levies it to differentiate that tax in favour of the Colonies, as distinct from those who are not members of the Empire, ought to be a circumstance in its favour. So much the more now, because the right hon. Gentleman will admit that the custom of the Colonies is now a matter of the greatest importance, and in future will probably be of vital necessity to this country. If that be so, may we not invoke another argument? Will any man of business deny that an individual trader will often make a small sacrifice in purchasing a commodity if by doing so he will not encourage or stimulate the trade of a rival? Suppose there is a competition between A. and B., and suppose B. can sell to A. cheaper than C., D., and E., A. would make a little sacrifice rather than add to his power. It is frequent in business that a man, rather than add to the power of a rival, will make temporary sacrifice so as not to advantage one whose competition is acute.

*MR. MOND (Chester): I do not wish to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, but as he challenged business men, as a business man I wish to say that I do not agree with him. If those are his views on business I am very glad for his own sake that he is not in business.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to hon. Members that they have no right to interrupt in order to make such statements as that just made. If an hon. Member has any arguments to bring forward the proper time is to do so when he is making a speech. He should not do it by interpolation.

*MR. LYTTELTON: I gave way because by the courtesy and custom of this House if any hon. Member has a statement to make it is usual to do so; but when advantage is taken of that courtesy to make a rude and, as I think, an irrelevant remark, it certainly does not encourage the continuance of what, before the hon. Member was a Member of this House, was a courtesy readily accorded. Notwithstanding the hon. Member's authority, if he has any in the matter, I will say without the slightest fear of contradiction that in many cases a trader will find it better policy to make some sacrifice rather than increase and thus cheapen his competitor's output. The object of colonial preference is the joint prosperity of the United Kingdom and of the Colonies, and the essence of it is that we should strengthen our allies rather than our rivals. The discredit which the President of the Board of Education sought to attach to colonial preference on historical grounds, namely, the friction which he alleged existed in the past, is perfectly easily understood, if you read history carefully. The reason was that preferences were imposed on the Colonies in favour of the Mother Country, and by the Mother Country. It is absurd to confuse the results of such colonial preference as this with the results of those. The present proposals have nothing to do with the imposition, by force or with a high hand, on the Colonies. On the contrary no advocate of Preference has ever passed beyond the principle recognised and expressed in the clearest terms by the late Lord Salisbury: give nothing to the Colonies except that which you can freely give to them and take nothing from them except what you can freely receive. The whole system is to be on a voluntary basis. I quite accept that. From this Government, pledged as they are, the Colonies could not expect any great or radical change in the fiscal system of the country, but I think the Government, without any sacrifice of principle or setting aside a single pledge made at the election might have taken the position that out of the existing taxes they might have made a trifling sacrifice of revenue without putting on a single extra tax, in order to establish the principle. I think the Colonies are entitled by their kinship with us and by the immense expectations we have from them in the future to the admission of the principle. I regret the Government have not seen their way to do that: not indeed as a Party man, for I can imagine nothing in the face of the movement of public opinion that will ultimately advantage us more than the attitude of Ministers who have asserted that a system which has only been in existence for some fifty or sixty years is unalterable. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and his colleagues have drawn the inference that the Colonial Premiers are asking for something unreasonable, and upon what is that supposition based? Upon nothing except the belief that our present fiscal system is so perfect that it cannot, even for a gain so splendid, receive the slightest modification. These are the grounds which make me give my adhesion to this Amendment, with the greatest possible enthusiasm, and I can only say that, four years from now, if this Conference again assembles, the right hon. Gentlemen, whoever they may be, who have to meet our Colonial friends, will, in Imperial interests, find themselves forced to give way in this matter.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.) said the speech just delivered differed very much in tone from that of the right hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had asked a Question about the Colonial Conference—why ought we not to meet the wishes of the Colonial Premiers? He had spoken in a more statesmanlike manner than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire, who had said that the Colonial Premiers had been met with a brutal refusal, while his right hon. friend had said that he had never expected that the Colonial Premiers would receive a favourable answer from the Government. He did not see that there was any reason why the Colonial Premiers should expect from the Government, at the head of a Free Trade Parliament, any other answer than that which they had received. His right hon. friend the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, had said that preference might be given to the Colonies without altering taxation, and he understood that these preferences were to be exceedingly slight. It would be almost laughing at the Colonies to offer them such a thing. His hon. friend the Member for Aston had alluded to South African wines. He really thought that they would not satisfy South Africa by giving her preference on wines. Who drank South African wines?

*MR. LYTTELTON: Dr. Jameson said he would very much like to see a preference given.

MR. LAMBTON said he knew that Dr. Jameson had said that he would very much like it, but we had our interests to consider, and we could not take our policy from the Colonial Premiers. Let them take, for instance, South African wines; how were they going to give the Colonies a preference on them? We did not drink so much wine now as we did some time back. Why was that? The public taste had altered. Was the hon. Gentleman going to dictate to the public of England what sort of wine they were to drink by imposing an import duty? If the people said that they did not want South African wines, Dr. Jameson would then say that the preference was of no good, and that they must put a higher tax on French and German wines in order to force the English people to drink South African wines. That would occur in most of the cases which the hon. Gentleman had put before them. He had never had much doubt about the meaning of the Amendment himself. From its wording it might have a good many meanings, but the speech of the right hon. Gentleman in moving it had dispelled that idea, for his speech was purely and simply protectionist. There was an Amendment on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Aston; it was not so long nor so complicated as that of the right hon. Gentleman, but it carried out the wishes of hon. Gentlemen on those benches who called themselves tariff reformers. The hon. Member for Aston's Amendment was blunt and straightforward. The official Amendment was rather like an overdressed Lady Godiva. He wanted to know why his hon. friends were afraid to call their proposals protection. Was not protection their aim and object? They must know that they were protectionists. Tariff reform as they presented it was protection. There might be a difference, but it was a very slight one and required considerable talent to find it out. The difference was exactly the same as the difference between grilse and salmon. Just as the grilse became salmon when it went into the deep sea, so the tariff reformer became a protectionist when he reached the city of Birmingham. Why should they be afraid of being called protectionists? They were never tired of abusing free trade and appealing to foreign countries. We were asked, "Are all these foreigners fools?" If they were, they were not ashamed of their folly. Why were tariff reformers? Why did they depreciate free trade if they did not want to get rid of it. They were always appreciating protection. Why did they appreciate it unless they wanted to justify it? He was reminded of the custom of the market. They wanted to barter for free trade and they went about abusing free trade. It was like the Vicar of Wakefield's horse sent to the fair. In treating with the dealers at the fair Dr. Primrose was told that the horse was "a blind spavinned galled hack only fit for the dog kennel." Dr. Primrose said—

> "By this time I had a most hearty contempt for the animal myself; I did not believe all they told me, yet from the number of witnesses I was under a strong presumption that they were right."

On the Opposition Benches there was a band of witnesses against free trade, but he would not join that band of witnesses. He could not give evidence contrary to his convictions, and he would not be an accessory to what he believed to be a crime against his country. He did not know how many there were, but he believed that there were many Members on that side of the House who shared his views. How many would come forward openly to state their objections to the Amendment he did not know, but he did know there were hundreds of thousands of Unionists in the country who would be grievously disappointed if they did not maintain in that House the principles which they adopted in the country. It might be pleaded that the unity of or loyalty to the party was a reason for adopting a policy which had shattered the Unionist Party, and, which in the end, if persisted in, would ruin the party. The candid friend was a very disagreeable person, but at all events he was more loyal than a false flatterer. What excuse had been adduced for this Amendment? Nothing had been urged, no new argument had been advanced, nothing but what had been refuted hundreds and thousands of times during the last four years. The only reason for the Amendment seemed to be that the tariff reformers were trying to raise sympathy and popularity, because at the present moment the Colonial Conference was taking place. They waved the Imperial flag in one hand, and in the other the flag of social reform, old age pensions, and many other impossible promises. He must say that he viewed with great concern this attempt to introduce the Colonies into a party question. The Colonial Premiers came here, as they had a perfect right to do, and the country, whose hospitality had been exercised, took great interest in them. The people of this country would feel sorry if their guests went empty away. He did not believe they would. He would ask hon. Members, were they prepared to give the Colonial Ministers everything they asked? Did they think that the Colonial Premiers, who had perfect liberty in their own countries over their own fiscal systems, should have a voice in the conduct of our fiscal arrangements? Would his hon. friends attach the same importance to the views of the Colonial Premiers on the Irish Council Bill, or on the larger policy to which that Bill would lead? There was no doubt in the world that Home Rule in Ireland would lead to protection, most probably to preference with the Colonies, and if the Colonial Premiers argued on that ground that they must give Home Rule to Ireland, would his hon. friends on those benches listen to such an argument? He thought that this was a great and serious occasion for the Unionist Party. It was a deliberate attempt by this Amendment to bind round the neck of the party the policy of protection. Why should they undertake these pledges? What was the necessity? In the Amendment his right hon. friend promised all sorts of things. He spoke of the "anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes," which he said "may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the present condition of national and Imperial trade." Why did hon. Members of his side want to hang these pledges round their necks? They were perfectly well aware that these taxes would in the long run be imposed, not because they would benefit the State, but because they would benefit someone else. That was observable in America, and yet there were hon. Members who said they wished to improve the trade of the country by imposing onerous conditions which would do no good to any man. They seemed to think that the more taxes there were the better it would be. There was a good deal of talk about goods "made in Germany." They would only be displaced by goods "taxed in Birmingham," and they would not be in any better position if we taxed them. It was a strange anomaly that hon. Members should suggest that we should tax everything because a man had to pay more for everything he used from his cradle to his coffin. These suggestions were embodied in this Amendment. They had been told by the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire that this Amendment was moved for other purposes as well. These other purposes were to capture the free traders who still remained in the party. He had some doubts whether they would go so far as to oppose the Amendment, but after the purely protectionist speeches they had heard it was the duty of hon. Members who believed in free trade to vote. What are they afraid of? Personally, he would not sit in this House one hour if he could not voice his opinion. Some of them might lose their seats, but at all events they would retain their honour."

*SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) said the Minister for Education had stated that the effect of the argument used by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer would be to tax the poor more and relieve the rich. In the absence of the President of the Board of Education, he would like to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he thought that all those legislative projects introduced by the President of the Board of Trade, the main object of which was to protect and defend the rights of British industries and British workmen, were tarred with the same brush, and tended towards injuring the poor and benefiting the rich. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to the paucity and the meagreness of the concessions foreshadowed by the Australian Premier. He wished to state that the Australians had not had a proper chance of drawing up any outlined scheme in consequence of the way in which they had been treated by the Government, because they were given plainly to understand beforehand that there was not even a shade of a shadow of a chance of the British Government, pledged as they were to the *status quo* of the present fiscal system, of even considering any preferential arrangement that might be outlined by the Colonial Premiers. The Minister for Education had said that the arguments they used against accepting the Colonial terms would have been the very arguments the Colonies themselves would have used if we had asked them to change their fiscal policy. Did the right hon. Gentleman think the 33½ per cent. preference which Canada gave to this country constituted no derogation from the advantages Canada would have received if instead of doing that she had given that preference to the United States? Statistics proved conclusively that the granting of this preference to the Mother Country by Canada had had the effect, not only of checking the dwindling away of British trade with Canada, but it had enormously added to its volume and importance. How could they expect the Colonies to come forward with any cut and dried scheme when they knew that the Government were absolutely opposed to even the smallest departure from the basis of existing taxation? In every part of the country it had been argued that the Canadian preference would be of no advantage to this country, and that it was given by Canada as a sort of attempt to extort further concessions from the Government. He thought the ascription of motives in this way was a very undesirable method to adopt even in regard to foreigners, but it was a still more undesirable course to pursue when dealing with a race of people of whom they were proud, and with whom they desired to carry on larger commercial relations. He looked upon this Budget as absolutely a Budget of despair. Not satisfied with the enormous revenue which the death duties and the income-tax at 1s. in the £ produced, the Chancellor of the Exchequer continued to pile on the agony. He thought he was quite justified in asking whether in any of those countries where democracy was in the ascendancy such taxes as those he had alluded to, so withering and blighting in their character, had been sanctioned. It was quite obvious that hon. Gentlemen opposite had yet to learn that capital, unlike labour, was extremely fluid, and when they tried to crush it out of existence, it was then that its mobile character became apparent; it sought more congenial surroundings. And yet, with all these disquieting prospects before him, the Chancellor of the Exchequer refused absolutely to turn to a perfectly legitimate and reliable source of taxation. For all his terrific onslaughts on every form of property, delivered and foreshadowed, what had the Chancellor of the Exchequer to show? A mere £2,000,000 for some scheme of old age pensions that would cost at least £25,000,000. There was absolutely no demand for old age pensions from the prudent and thrifty amongst the members of friendly societies. In any scheme of old age pensions it was the personal contributory element which alone could free it from the stigma of pauperism and charity, and that feature was conspicuously absent from the scheme which had been put forward.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

---

## KINGSTON-UPON-HULL CORPORATION BILL. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered.

Mr. FERENS (Hull, E.) moved to insert the following proviso to Clause 5: "Provided also that no allowance shall be made for compulsory sale, but the arbitrator, arbitrators, or umpire, who shall determine such price or consideration (in this section called 'the court'), may make such allowance as they think just for recoupment of any loss of interest pending reinvestment, as well as for the cost of reinvestment, and for covering any costs, charges, and expenses (other than costs incurred in any arbitration under this Act), which have been, or are likely to be, incurred in consequence of the passing of this Act by the company or the stockholders therein, and which ought, in the opinion of the court, to be borne by the corporation." He said the gas supply of Hull had until recently been in the hands of three companies—the British Gas Light Company, the Kingston-upon-Hull Gas Company, and the East Hull Gas Company. In addition to the gas undertaking, the corporation owned the water, the electric lighting, the electric power, and the tramway undertakings. Perhaps he was not exaggerating when he said that the tramway system was the best in the country. Those industrial undertakings had been so well managed by the corporation as to contribute to the reduction of the rates between £20,000 and £30,000 per annum. The East Hull Gas Company affected by this Bill were established in 1846 and obtained their first Parliamentary powers in 1867. The Hull Corporation for many years had intended to purchase the East Hull Gas Company when the opportunity came. In the last session of Parliament the gas company promoted a Bill to enable them to raise a large sum of additional capital and also to obtain further powers, to which it was not necessary to refer in detail. The corporation were not informed of the intended promotion of that Bill and were not aware of the promotion until after the last day fixed by the standing orders to take the first steps in the promotion of a Bill themselves, and were not, therefore, in a position to promote a Bill last year to purchase the company's undertaking. They, however, opposed the company's Bill upon the ground that they should have an opportunity of purchasing the undertaking, and at their instance the Committee of the House of Commons to whom the Bill was referred, which was presided over by the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division, inserted a clause to the effect that if the corporation promoted a Bill in Parliament in the present session to enable them to purchase the undertaking nothing contained in last year's Act should in any way prejudge or prejudice the question of purchase, and that if the corporation's Bill became law, the value of the company's undertaking should not be enhanced or depreciated by the passing of last year's Act. The corporation accordingly were promoting the present Bill to empower them to purchase the undertaking, and they had, of course, obtained the necessary sanction of the ratepayers. The Bill proposed that in case the two parties concerned could not agree as to price it should be referred to arbitration in accordance with the provisions of the Lands

Clauses Acts, and, as was well known, these provisions were the most favourable from the point of view of the vendor. There was no provision whatever, in the Lands Clauses Acts requiring that any additional allowance should be given in respect of compulsory purchase, but the practice had been, and was now, quite settled under those Acts, where the subject matter of the purchase was lands or buildings, to make an addition to the sum awarded on the ground that the purchase was compulsory. The reasons given for this practice varied, but it was apparently generally recognised that there were two principal reasons, namely—(1) That there might be a difficulty in accurately determining the value of land which might have some dormant value not yet developed—some possible appreciation in value; and (2) That where an owner was required against his will to part with land for which, owing to its having been in his family for years, or for other reasons, he might have an affection, something in the nature of solatium should be given to him. The usual practice in the case of lands and buildings was to make an allowance which was probably never less and sometimes exceeded 10 per cent Neither of the foregoing reasons had any application in the case of the purchase of a gas undertaking, particularly such an undertaking as the one dealt with in the present Bill. In such a case as that, an experienced arbitrator, assisted on either side by valuers who were constantly dealing with questions of this kind, would have no difficulty in arriving at the true value of the undertaking. This was done by ascertaining from past experience what was the amount of maintainable profits which the company (having regard to the provisions limiting their profits) were entitled to distribute in the shape of dividends, and by multiplying the sum so arrived at by an appropriate number of years purchase so that each shareholder could re-invest the money paid to him in other securities, equally safe, to produce exactly the same revenue. The dividend of the East Hull gas company was strictly limited to 7½ per cent., so that there was no fluctuation on the shares. In such a case as this, there could be no dormant value and the true value could be ascertained with great exactitude. The first reason, therefore, for which the allowance was given in the case of lands did not apply. Moreover, the second reason that an allowance should be given as a solatium to the owner for parting with property for which he might have an affection, was hardly applicable in the case of a gas share. One could not well imagine anyone having a sentimental feeling for a gas share. Consequently, he submitted that the practice of making an allowance for compulsory purchase ought not to be applied in the case of the purchase of the present undertaking, and his Amendment accordingly proposed, in the first place, to exclude an allowance for compulsory purchase. In order, however, to treat the shareholders in the company quite fairly, the Amendment proceeded to provide that the arbitrators were to make such an allowance as they thought just for recoupment of any loss of interest pending reinvestment, for cost of reinvestment, and for certain other costs. Obviously it might take some time before the shareholder was able to reinvest the money which he received, and he might be put to some expense in the matter, and it was only fair that these circumstances should be taken into consideration and a proper allowance made accordingly. The provision was taken practically word for word from Section 23, Sub-section (8), of the Metropolis Water Act, 1902, under which eight water companies' undertakings in London were acquired by the Metropolitan Water Board. It would be remembered that that was a Government Bill under the late Government, the late President of the Local Government Board being responsible for it. It was a public Bill, but nevertheless it was referred to a Joint Select Committee of the two Houses of Parliament, and counsel were heard before the Committee on behalf of the Local Government Board and of the Water Companies. The question was, therefore, very adequately considered, and the clause was settled in a form which dealt fairly as between the ratepayers who were buying and the shareholders who were selling. He was not aware that any other precedent existed for the exact proposal now put forward, but in recent years there had been several Acts which excluded allowance for compulsory purchase, namely, the Tramways Act, 1870, Section 43, where dealing with the purchase of tramways; the Electric Lighting Act, 1882, where dealing with the purchase of electric lighting undertakings; the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890, and the Local Government Act, 1894, with reference to the purchase of lands by parish councils or for the purposes of allotments. He submitted that the provision excluding compensation for compulsory purchase was particularly applicable in the present case, because the shareholders would, in fact, receive from the corporation a good deal more than they had put into the concern. By their Act of 1867 the company were specially authorised to issue all their additional capital by auction or tender at the best price obtainable, but instead of adopting that course, and although the shares already issued were at a considerable premium, they had issued all additional capital to their own shareholders at par, practically, therefore, giving them a very considerable bonus. The proviso now proposed to be inserted was included in the original Bill which passed the Second Reading, but was struck out by the Committee. Apparently the Committee objected to the provision, not on its merits, but on the ground that its insertion would, in the absence of a precedent in a Bill to acquire a gas undertaking, be beyond their powers. When the question was being discussed by the Hon. J. D. Fitzgerald, K.C., on behalf of the promoters, he was stating that the Committee were sitting there as "legislators," when he was interrupted by the chairman, the hon. and learned Member for Rugby, who said—

> "Oh, no. If you came to me as a legislator (I am speaking now of course personally, and not at all as Chairman of this Committee) if you came to me as a Member of the House of Commons and asked me to vote for the Second Reading of a Bill proposing something of this kind, I should give you an entirely different answer to the answer that I should give you as a member of this Committee. As I understand, this Committee is bound by precedent and it is only entitled (as I understand the practice) to make a new precedent where a case of public necessity or of local necessity is made out."

Moreover, in the announcement of the decision of the Committee in disallowing the proviso, the Chairman stated as follows—

> "If this clause were allowed, in the opinion of the Committee, it would be the creation of precedent in the matter of compensation which they think, if it is to be created at all, must be created by Parliament itself in a public Bill."

He did not bring this Amendment forward in antagonism to the Police and Sanitary Committee, but to give the House the opportunity of doing what the Committee felt was more than they ought to undertake. It was a very important matter and this was the only opportunity the House would have of considering the proposal. If it were necessary to do so for the present purposes, it might, with all respect to the Police and Sanitary Committee, be well contended that the Committee had under-rated their powers. They were an unusually large and exceptionally strong Committee, and they should, he suggested, not hesitate to create a precedent if it were necessary to do so, in order that justice might be done; and he further submitted that justice would not be done as between the ratepayers of Hull and gas consumers on the one hand, and the shareholders in the company on the other hand, if the proviso were not inserted. Accepting, however, for the moment, the view of the Committee that a precedent was necessary, it was submitted that such precedent was clearly provided by the Metropolis Water Act. The only possible distinction between the two cases was that in the London case the shareholders were making their income from the supply of water, and that here the shareholders in the company were making their income from supplying gas. This could not possibly affect the question as to whether the shareholders were to receive at the hands of the ratepayers more than the full value of their shares, together with such a sum as might be necessary to enable them to re-invest the purchase money without loss. Apart from the London precedent, there were also the Housing of the Working Classes Act and other public Acts. Moreover, Committees of Parliament were constantly modifying the Lands Clauses Acts, and in each case where this was done for the first time, a precedent was created "in the matter of compensation." For example—one of the principles of the Lands Clauses Acts was that the sum to be paid for the land was the value thereof to the vendor and that no deduction could be made in respect of any improved value which might attach to other lands held by him by reason of the execution of the improvement for which the lands were acquired. This principle was frequently put aside by Committees by the insertion of a provision to the effect that the tribunal were to take into account any increase in value to the lands retained, which would result from the proposed works. Further, the Land Clauses Acts prohibited the compulsory acquisition of part only of a house. Committees were constantly excluding this provision and allowing part of a house to be acquired. Again the Lands Clauses Acts provided that in all cases the vendor was entitled to his costs unless the purchaser made an offer of a sum not less than that ultimately awarded. Committees frequently modified this provision so as to deprive the vendor of his costs if he did not give to the purchaser adequate information. Further, under the Lands Clauses Acts the value of the property sold was ascertained as on the date on which notice to treat was given, so that the vendor could erect buildings and create new interests in the property between the date of the passing of the Act and the service of the notice and thus increase the purchase money. Committees frequently amended this provision also by providing that no such buildings erected or interests created after a fixed date before the passing of the Act were to be allowed for. In those cases, it would be observed, the Lands Clauses Acts were amended, and precedents in each case were created in regard to compensation for land, a matter to which the Lands Clauses Acts were intended to apply. So much the more could a Committee modify the Acts when applying them to the purchase of a gas undertaking, a subject matter to which they were not intended in the first instance to apply. It should be stated that when the Committee decided that the preamble of the Bill was proved, the gas company, in order to have their hands free to deal with the whole matter in the House of Lords, withdrew, and took no part in the discussion upon the clauses. He could but believe that his Amendment would meet with the approbation of the Committee, and he, with confidence, commended it to the favourable consideration of the House.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central), in seconding, said that personally he had no quarrel with the action of the Committee. The Committee had acted strictly within the restrictions which Parliament had imposed upon them, and if they had gone outside the precedents they would not have acted in accordance with the usual custom of the House. But they were now in a different atmosphere; they had left the atmosphere of the Committee and come down to that of the House of Commons, which, in these respects, was said to be omnipotent. It was not the business of the Committee to create precedents; that was the business of the House. He was not asking the House of Commons to inflict any slur on any Committee of the House of Commons; but he was asking the House to make a precedent. The position here was that the gas company was being bought out by the corporation of Hull. Everybody knew how corporations were bled by private companies in these circumstances, which prevented the municipalities carrying out improvements which they desired to do. This gas company were absolutely prohibited by their Act from receiving more than 7½ per cent. dividend on their stock. Why on earth should they get a premium on their shares over and above the full equivalent for a 7½ per cent. stock, merely because the shares were handed over from one person to another? On whom would the loss fall? On the ratepayers, who were the consumers of the gas, and who would have consequently to pay more for their gas. He was the last man in the world who would advocate anything that would derogate from the rights of property; but he denied that the shareholders of the gas company should receive more than the fair equivalent of profits provided for them in their original Act of Parliament. The precedent had been quoted of the Metropolitan Water Board, but that Bill was a public Bill, and no doubt could not be adduced as an argument in regard to this Bill, which was a private measure.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 6, line 17, after the word 'contained,' to insert the words 'Provided also that no allowance shall be made for compulsory sale, but the arbitrator, arbitrators, or umpire, who shall determine such price or consideration (in this section called 'the court'), may make such allowance as they think just for recoupment of any loss of interest pending reinvestment, as well as for the cost of reinvestment, and for covering any costs, charges, and expenses (other than costs incurred in any arbitration under this Act), which have been, or are likely to be, incurred in consequence of the passing of this Act by the company or the stockholders therein, and which ought, in the opinion of the court, to be borne by the corporation.' "—(*Mr. Ferens.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the Bill."

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said he opposed the Amendment because he considered it a dangerous precedent that ought not to be followed. There was no reason why municipalities should not pay 10 per cent. more for property taken by them compulsorily for municipal trading purposes when other people had to pay that 10 per cent. according to long-established principles.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) thought the Amendment involved a very important principle, and that no injustice was involved in it at all, because the holders of the present stock were practically guaranteed in regard to their dividend if their business was transferred to the corporation. He did not see why a public body when they had to buy should pay a 10 per cent. increase in price in consequence of compulsory purchase. They had to look after the interest of the public. He thought the Amendment was in the direction of enabling municipalities to acquire an undertaking on fair terms and to conduct the undertaking on business lines. He therefore associated himself with the Amendment.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said the speech which the hon. Member had just delivered was an admirable one in favour of the alteration of the Lands Clauses Consolidation Acts, but it was not a speech which showed that they should break an established rule of the House. That was the principle which lurked behind the Amendment which had been moved. There was no precedent for such a provision as the Amendment proposed in regard to a gas undertaking being inserted by a Committee. The practice of allowing something for compulsory purchase had been applied to every case of gas or water purchase that had come before the House, except that of the Metropolis Water Act, which counsel for the corporation admitted, before the Committee over which he presided, was an exceptional case, and was a public Act. He did not say that there might not be a case for alteration, but if the practice were altered it should be done by a public Bill, which could be fully considered by the House and the Government.

*MR. LUKE WHITE (Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose) quite agreed that the Committee had no power to make any alteration in the ordinary practice or to make this new departure. The House itself, however, had full power to do so according to the precedent in the case of the London Water Companies, and therefore he supported the Amendment, which would give to the shareholders all they were entitled to and ensure that justice was done between them and the corporation. Therefore in the interests of all concerned he had great pleasure in supporting the Amendment.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said he did not think such a case of hardship had been made out in this case as would lead to the House departing from its precedent in these matters. He viewed with some alarm the setting up of such claims by corporations who, though representing the ratepayers in some degree, also had a somewhat fiduciary capacity. An argument which had not been sufficiently considered in this case was the great inconvenience and loss that fell upon those who had to sell under these compulsory powers. It must be borne in mind that money could not be reinvested without expense, without risk, or without trouble, labour, and anxiety for which some compensation ought to be paid. On that ground alone there ought to be some allowance, though he did not say what the allowance ought to be in this case. He hoped the House would support the Committee in what they had done. He agreed that the House was paramount in these matters, but they must bear in mind that the Committees gave much anxious labour to these inquiries, and that they created precedents not on their own initiative, but only after consideration of case after case and after years of experience; and the House could not expect Members to devote their time to this work in Committee unless their decisions were treated with the highest respect. If the hon. Gentleman went to a division he would be obliged to vote against the Amendment.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said he was not so wedded to precedent that he would not depart from it, but before he did so he would have to have a strong case and good reason shown for it in order that a revised precedent might be laid down for the future. If the House accepted the Amendment he did not think it would ever become a precedent for the Houses of Parliament. One case only had been quoted, and that was not on all fours with the case before the House. He had heard cases of this kind argued many times, and the case in which the allowance for compulsory purchase appeared to him to be rather hard was when a corporation was seeking compulsory powers, not for the purpose of a profitable undertaking, but for the purposes of public health; where it was often a case of buying insanitary property and pulling it down for the benefit of the public health and the general welfare of the people. It might be quite right and fair to throw over a precedent of this kind, but he contended that it ought to be done only by a public Bill and after buyers and sellers had had ample notice that those would be the conditions under which they would treat. He supported the Committee in this matter.

*MR. C. NICHOLSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Doncaster), as a member of the Committee which considered this Bill said he supported the action that that Committee had taken. His experience was short, but he did not think the House liked any sudden interruption or alteration of the practice and custom upon which the Committees acted. Therefore he thought the Committee were quite right in striking out this particular clause. He, however, thought there was too much reverence paid to precedents and too little consideration given to the time and circumstances under which they were created. The difficulty was to consider where the line should be drawn and what precedents should be regarded, and what ought to be left to the consideration of the House. In this case in his opinion the Committee were quite right. The question raised here was whether the Committee ought to make a new rule for compensation in dealing with matters by private Bill. There was no doubt if that was once granted this provision would be inserted in every Bill of a like character that came before the Committee. It was, therefore, desirable that the House should consider and decide once and for all which principle should be adopted. He thought the line ought to be drawn between the purchase of land and property and the purchase of undertakings in which the interest of those concerned was purely financial. A person who was compelled to part with his house was entitled to more consideration than a man who sold a commercial undertaking, because it made very little difference to a shareholder, whose interests had alone been changed, whereas round a man's house there were many interests of a personal character which had grown up from association which could not be measured by a money compensation. He therefore hoped the House would allow this clause to stand. He should oppose the Amendment.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said that so far as he could see the question before the House was whether in this particular Bill under the particular circumstances of the case the House should sanction a complete abandonment of the practice that had hitherto unanimously been imposed on the Committees by the House for sixty years. That was a considerable proposal to make to the House. Surely, if they were going to make such a fundamental change it ought to be done by a Bill before a full House, when all the reasons for and against it could be fully weighed. What was here asked was a complete reversal of the practice and procedure of the House, which had continued for sixty years, and the introduction of a dangerous and far-reaching principle into the consideration of private Bills. The precedent of the Water Board Bill had been referred to, but that was no precedent at all. The Water Board Bill was a public Bill; and then, again, the state of affairs with regard to the water companies of London was that for years they had been threatened bodies; Bills had been brought in and had been rejected; and these companies had lived for years on the understanding that they were to be bought out. He did not know what might be the circumstances of Kingston-upon-Hull, but he took leave to say that the position of this particular gas company was entirely different from that of the London water companies in regard to purchase. There was no precedent for this very large change, which he confidently submitted to the House ought not to be introduced into their ancient practice. The existing principle was well established; everybody knew what it meant; it was to leave these matters to the good sense of the arbitrator on the understanding that an allowance would be made, usually 10 per cent. for compulsory disturbance, reimbursement for losses, and so forth. It might well be that vendors had been awarded undue profits by arbitrators, but if that were so it was, after all, due to human nature, which doubtless tenanted the breast of an arbitrator as that of any other person, and it might be that at times he dealt tenderly with those who were compulsorily turned out of their properties. But, notwithstanding those grounds, no single reason had been shown why the House should depart from an ancient practice in favour of this Bill.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea) said it was perhaps natural that hon. Gentlemen representing the borough of Hull should ask for exceptional treatment for that town; and, if it were done in the right way, at the right time, and with reasonable notice, perhaps more could be said for their claim than could be advanced in the existing circumstances. The proposal now before the House was struck out of the Bill by the Committee, notwithstanding which the Member for Hull persisted in appealing to the House to do what the proper tribunal, after reviewing all the facts, had declined to do. The common form in all private Bills for the acquisition of properties was the application of the Lands Clauses Act. This had been followed in all cases since 1845 except in the very exceptional case of the London Water Act. But that precedent did not apply to this case, as the London Water Act was a public Act for which the Ministry of the day took responsibility, and which dealt with interests of vast magnitude. If its precedent were applied to this Bill every other private Bill before the House ought to be similarly treated, and even if that were done it would not meet the case of Bills already passed which would have lost the advantage of the Amendment. Why should Hull get unique treatment by way of a private Bill? It was hardly fair that the parties interested in this Bill should receive treatment as if the Lands Clauses Act had been varied by a public Bill—a course which at that moment they were not capable of adopting. The precedents of which the two hon. Members had spoken were not of the character which they had indicated. In the case of Housing Bills the principle of the Lands Clauses had either to be varied or modified or set aside, and that could only be done where the House approved of it. Where public bodies asked for lands to be taken away for public purposes it was done by public Bill. The Lands Clauses Acts had been set aside, and Michael Angelo Taylor's Act also, to enable them to vary the Lands Clauses principle, and the general principle in regard to acquiring property, but all that had been done by public Bill. And he put it to the supporters of the extension of municipal ownership, and of municipal trading, that to vary these well-established conditions under which all municipalities had automatically acquired properties, and trading concerns taken over from private hands, would be to create a precedent which he believed would be dangerous, and for this reason: he thought that the Lands Clauses practice might be too generous; or it might be onerous, as it occasionally was to intending purchasers; but if it was to be altered they ought either to alter the Standing Orders of the House, or else amend by Bill the Lands Clauses Act. If that were to be done, as it might perhaps have to be done, it would facilitate the transfer of monopolies and other interests to municipalities. No one could accuse him of being indifferent to the interests of municipalities; on the contrary, few men in so short a life had done more to transfer great concerns from private hands to public bodies. He had always believed in it. We were all collectivists by compensation nowadays—he had adhered to that view because he thought it the line of least resistance. But if they embarked upon a public policy otherwise than in a public Bill voted by both Houses, they would make the task of the acquisition of private properties by public bodies more difficult in the future than it was now. If they were going to make the condition of transfer less onerous to public bodies and less generous to private concerns, that was a strong argument in favour of the view that any such step as the alteration of their Standing Orders, or the modification or abolition of the Lands Clauses provision ought only to be made on the responsibility of the Government, so that everybody concerned could go into the matter with the whole of the facts before them. That issue should not be determined merely because two Members of a municipality were anxious to get favourable terms for their locality, but should be decided by a public Bill, brought in on the responsibility of the Minister. The post of office frequently meant the firing line of duty, and it was his duty as the Minister partly responsible for this branch of public affairs, in the interests of fair and just treatment for all municipalities, to say that it would be against public policy to have on this particular subject a snatch vote which would recoil on the old policy of municipalities being allowed to acquire and retain powers which they were anxious to possess. He asked that there should be some reasonable continuity in these matters; the best thing to do was to adhere to the old policy which had been adopted for the last sixty years. If that policy was to be altered it should be done fairly and justly by the Government at the instance of a Minister responsible to the House and not in the way now proposed by the hon. Member for Hull.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 73, Noes, 123. (Division List No. 166.)

## AYES.

Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Barnes, G. N.
Brace, William
Brooke, Stopford
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Crooks, William
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Murphy, John
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Philipps, Col. Ivor (S'thampton)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Steadman, W. C.
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Ferens and Sir Henry Seymour King.

## NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ashley, W. W.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beach, Hon. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonpr't
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John

*Mr. Burns.*

Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Cairns Thomas
Cawley, Sir Frederiek
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett,A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E Grinst'd)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig,CaptainJames(Down,E. )
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Davies,David(Montgomery Co.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,H. )
Hervey,F.W.F. (BuryS.Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hunt, Rowland
Jackson, R. S.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Lambert, George
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln )
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Murnaghan, George
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nuttall, Harry
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease,HerbertPike (Darlington
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E. B.(Bradford,E.)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Simon, John Allsebrook
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Corrie Grant and Mr. J. W Wilson.

Bill to be read the third time.

---

## FINANCE BILL.

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time":—

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the financial needs of the country, as disclosed in the Budget statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, require that the basis of taxation should be broadened in order that the anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the present condition of national and Imperial trade.'"—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*)—instead thereof, resumed.

Question again proposed.

*SIR EDWARD SASSOON, continuing his speech, said he had alluded to a dissimilarity between capital and labour. He would now indicate a point at which they converged and assimilated. Capital like labour was one of the raw materials without which industries decayed and manufacturers ceased to flourish. Furthermore capital represented the very life-blood of a normal and progressive expansion of all forms of industrial and commercial activity. When the attack made on capital reached the straining point he submitted that that policy became industrially inexpedient and wasteful and economically incapable of being defended. His hon. friend the Member for Durham had asked why we should make any alteration in our fiscal system. Might he venture to submit one or two reasons? After two years of unexampled prosperity at home, with abounding wealth, with an overflowing Treasury, with millionaires shuffling off this mortal coil in order to replenish the Treasury, with magnificent trade returns, with abnormal receipts from the coinage of silver—with all these phenomenal aids to our financial resources, what had the Chancellor of the Exchequer done? He was going in for abnormally high taxes on articles of food and non-alcoholic beverages. In the case of tea 97½ per was opposed to any tax which would be at all in the nature of a protective duty, Well, a ten per cent. duty on manufactured goods may be a very low duty, but clearly it must be more or less of a protective duty. If a duty of that kind were imposed, I find that the total number of articles which would be taxed would amount to between 200 and 300. In time of war taxes were imposed upon coal, corn and sugar. Two of these duties have been taken off, and probably the third will disappear as soon as it is not desirable for the purpose of our present finances. I think our present fiscal system, which has grown up gradually, is the right basis on which we ought to levy our taxes. It has been growing up since 1843, and came to fruition in 1860, and under it, by confining the taxes to a few articles of general consumption, no impediment is imposed on trade, while the cost of collection is reduced to a minimum. While many duties have gone, while others have been greatly reduced, and none has been added, the Customs and Excise, which in 1860 produced forty-two millions, now produces sixty-two millions. This is a sufficient testimony to the advantage of the present system of taxation. In the late war, moreover, the present system provided the means by which taxation was easily raised. I do not know how far the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's agrees with his right hon. friend about the ten per cent. on manufactured goods; but they both advocated preference, and we all know that preference can only be given by imposing a tax on corn, wheat, bread, butter, and other articles of daily consumption, and it is proposed with that money to reduce the taxation on tobacco, tea and sugar. I will ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is better to have a tax on six articles instead of on three. We hear a good deal about a free breakfast table; but the right hon. Gentleman proposes to attack the dinner table of the working man.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The promise of a free breakfast table has been unfulfilled up to the present moment.

*Mr. Sydney Buxton.*

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: That is due to the £240,000,000 which the late Government put upon the expenditure for war purposes. The only point of the right hon. Gentleman out of which I can make an exact and concrete proposition is that he is very anxious, as his leader was the other day, that the shilling income-tax should be reduced. I do not deny for one moment that a shilling income-tax is a very high figure, but I do not think it should be forgotten that that shilling income-tax will be borne by only a few persons, and by no one with an income under £2,000. If the present Budget goes through those below £2,000, to the number of half a million or so, will be relieved. Although I do not deny that a shilling income-tax is a heavy duty, still I do not agree with the right hon. Gentleman that it is a tax which weighs very heavily upon the trade and industry of this country, whereas all the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman opposite for broadening the basis of taxation will fall in some way on the consumer. And while I should be prepared to say that it would be desirable that the income-tax should be reduced, I say it should not be reduced in such a manner as to alter the relation between direct and indirect taxation. In other words, it ought not to be reduced unless the indirect taxation is also proportionately reduced. I do not think it is a right thing that the income-tax payer should be relieved at the expense of the consumer of articles of general consumption. The right hon. Gentleman makes three proposals for the broadening of the basis of taxation; first, retaliation, secondly, preference, and, thirdly, the taxation of foreign manufactured goods. Retaliation will give us no relief; but it is said by the Leader of the Opposition that he only asks for retaliation in case it is necessary to use it, and he merely wants it because the threat of retaliation will make other countries give way in regard to their tariffs. Obviously there is no revenue to be derived from retaliation and therefore we are left with the question of preference. What amount of revenue does the right hon. Gentleman expect to get from preferences which are going to do the evils to which I have referred? He says they will not touch raw materials. I am surprised at that, because the right hon. Gentleman says that an additional preference tax on corn, meal, and butter will not really add to the price to the consumer; and what is true of wheat, meal, and butter, must be equally true with regard to raw materials. But it is not the fact that hon. Gentlemen opposite are willing to withdraw raw materials from taxation. I do not believe you can carry on a legitimate and systematic system of preference unless you tax the raw material of industries. The right hon. Member for St. George's said you cannot expect in these matters mathematical precision; but what we say is that if it is true, as we are told it is, that the only way to keep the Empire together is by these commercial bonds in addition to others, they will not help us very much in keeping the Empire together. Some parts of the Empire cannot benefit if we do not tax raw materials, and if we are going to lose our other Colonies because we will not give them preference, I am afraid it is a very bad look-out for the Cape. The proposal is to put a duty on articles of large consumption, such as corn, meat and butter. The right hon. Member for West Birmingham estimated that that would produce about £4,400,000 a year. That does not seem very much among all these claimants to whom the right hon. Gentleman has referred. But even so, what is he going to do with his £4,400,000? It is true the liquor duties would not be touched, and tobacco is a luxury and therefore the duty is not to be touched. [An HON. MEMBER: Yes.] Then that would take off a considerable slice of the £4,400,000. Then the duty on sugar has been dwelt upon. That tax was after all put on to broaden the basis of taxation. My right hon. friend, in his Budget speech, enunciated the irresistible argument that though it would be a good thing if we could get rid of it altogether, to reduce the sugar duty by one-half would be uneconomical and wasteful. You would retain all the vexations and all the cost of collecting the tax, and the farthing would not go to the consumer, but to the middleman. So much was that thought to be the fact at the time when the sugar tax was repealed in 1874 by Sir Stafford Northcote that he repealed it largely on the ground that the factor was uneconomic. I suppose, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman does not propose to deal with that. That leaves the tea duty, and I do not believe it would be to the advantage of the working man in this country to have his tea duty reduced at the expense of a duty on meat, corn, and butter. The only tax still remaining, therefore, at a high figure is the income-tax. That I have dealt with, and I should steadily resist the reduction of the income-tax and the expansion of those taxes to which I have referred. I have said that the estimated revenue was £4,400,000. We have to recollect this in regard to preferential duties; the object of this proposal for preference is that Colonial corn and meat shall supersede that of foreign countries. What does that mean? It means that by so much as these Colonial products take the place of foreign produce the revenue disappears; that the more successful this system of preference is the less revenue will there be year by year; that if it is carried out with the success that is anticipated there can be no reduction in the taxes from which we suffer so much. That is what retaliation and preference come to. With regard to the taxation of manufactured articles, to which the right hon. Gentleman says his whole Party is committed, I do not know what his Chief Whip thinks of that; we have always up to now looked upon him as a free trader.

SIR A. ACLAND HOOD (Somerset, Wellington): We are all free traders.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: What is really proposed in regard to this duty on manufactured articles? I am prepared to admit that the right hon. Gentleman and those who support him do not desire to go back to the bad old days when these duties were very high, but, as I have pointed out, they will have to go back to an extent, and to have duties on an enormous number of articles in place of the simplicity we have in our present system. Therefore, we are entitled to ask how they are going to define manufactured articles. I should like to ask the Leader of the Opposition, now that we understand that these proposals for preference are adopted by the right hon. Gentleman, whether he agrees with the view put forward by his right hon. colleague—whether he is in favour of an export tax on foreign manufactures, because that must be in the nature of a protective duty, its whole object being to protect our industries. I should like to know whether he is in favour of a protective duty. I ask the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire how he is going to define foreign manufactures. He is against the taxation of raw material, and I believe that it is beyond the wit of man to disentangle wholly and partly-manufactured articles from one another. In the second fiscal Blue-book these articles are defined as far as they can be, and they amount to about £180,000,000 and produce about £10,000,000 a year. Is the right hon. Gentleman really going to tax these partly-manufactured articles to which I have referred? I remember that when the right hon. Gentleman went to Warrington he, in a celebrated speech, proposed to tax foreign wire. Norwich manufacturers who use foreign wire in the production of a more complete manufacture said that the proposal was all very well for Warrington, but it would not suit Norwich. I remember Mr. Gladstone illustrating the difficulty of these definitions by mentioning a curious dispute as to whether a mummy which had been imported was to be taxed as raw material, a partly-manufactured, or a wholly manufactured article. I believe it was finally declared to be a completely manufactured article. We are in a very great difficulty with regard to this matter, and we are entitled to some answer from the right hon. Gentleman as to how far and to what extent he proposes to tax these partly-manufactured articles. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman will be able to carry out the proposals which he has made across the floor of the House. He has suggested the reduction of the income-tax, but no such reduction ought to take place at the expense of indirect taxation and at the expense of the consumer. Whatever way we look at it, whether from the point of broadening taxation, of preference, of retaliation or of protection, I believe it will be shown that our present system of taxation for revenue purposes on a few articles of consumption is in its simplicity by far the best for the finances of this country. The right hon. Gentleman is not likely to get for his proposals a sufficient amount to attain his ends, and any departure from our present system is likely to lead us into hopeless financial confusion.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) said that the right hon. Gentleman in his speech had used only the stock arguments which were in use fifty or sixty years ago, and he had added nothing to the knowledge which had been obtained since that time. He had said that if retaliation were successful and other countries were induced to lower their duties, then no revenue would be obtained. Quite true; but had the right hon. Gentleman reflected on the enormous increase of employment it would give to this country? Unless they argued this question from the point of view of good, constant, well-paid employment, which was the solution of all our social difficulties, they missed the main point. Some years ago we imported 600,000 gallons of wine per annum from South Africa. An understanding made with France put an end to that; but if we were to give preference to South Africa in wines and tobacco, the purchasing power of South Africa would be increased and we should get the benefit of it. The right hon. Gentleman had asked how the difference between wholly and partially-manufactured goods was to be defined, and said it was beyond the wit of man to define it. It did not defy the wit of man, but it defied the wit of the present Government to do it. It did not defy the wit of other Governments like those of Germany and France. What was the test which they adopted? They took a certain article and judged how much labour was in it, and to the extent of the labour in it they required that import duty to be paid upon it. That was an effective way of doing it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had not only slammed the door in the face of our Colonial brethren, but he had had the hardihood to assure them that the last general election had finally settled the question of free trade. If the Government really believed that, then let them appeal to the country on that one particular point, and they would get quite a different answer. Everything had changed since the year 1860. The carriage and other expenses connected with the importation of corn, which was once equal to about 10s. or 12s. per quarter, had disappeared, although the Cobden school at that time thought they were going to remain. Everything was different now. It was said that under free trade no more land would go out of cultivation, and in less than five years every nation would follow our example. Food was to be abundant and cheap, pauperism was to disappear from England, workhouses were to be abolished; it was said that workhouses would be seen standing ruined and empty as monuments of the success of a free trade policy. But all that had not come about. The workhouses of to-day were bigger and more numerous. Pauperism had increased considerably, and its cost was now more than four or five times as much as it used to be. Everything which had been foretold in regard to free trade had not come to pass. If that was the case where was the success of this one-sided free trade which was no more like real free trade than chalk was like cheese? Foreign countries always kept the producer to the front. In America the producer was always considered first because the greater the production the greater the employment. The greater the employment the more money there was to buy with, and when there was plenty of money to buy foreign countries rightly put price in the second place. In this country they placed the consumer first and the producer second, with the result that they had no employment and no money to buy with, and under those circumstances what did it matter about the price? At present they put an import duty upon what they did not produce. If, instead, they put a duty on what they did produce, the weekly budget of the housekeeper would not be a farthing more, but the employment would be greater, because there would be a greater production of those things in this country, and there would be more regular employment. He had listened with interest to the admirable speech of the hon. Member for the Blackfriars Division of Glasgow, and he agreed with him as to the inequality in the distribution of the wealth of the country. In what the hon. Member said about poverty and misery and destitution, his description was very touching. He followed up his argument by saying that things were getting worse, but this was under so-called free trade. His remedy, however, seemed to resolve itself into one of charity and State aid for the sufferers. He had stated that they wanted several great social reforms based on free trade, and that they would cost millions of money. He did not tell them where the money was to come from, but simply said that he would place that task upon the shoulders of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In his opinion nothing had helped forward the question of fiscal reform so effectually as the Budget which had been introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was a Budget of despair. It stated in so many words that the Government had got to the end of their tether as far as other sources of revenue were concerned. It was practically admitted that under the present system it was impossible to get any more money to carry out those great social reforms which they were all anxious to see brought about. In this country the import duty upon food and drink was higher than in any other country. An import duty on silks, satins, motor cars, and a thousand and one other things would increase employment in this country. They very properly objected to the importation of sweated labour, but why did they favour the importation of the productions of sweated labour? There was an enormous trade in hats in the Midland counties. The bulk of the hat trade abroad was done in Italy by people who worked for 8s. to 10s. a week, their hours of labour being from twelve to fourteen per day. He wanted an answer to this question. Supposing 100 of these Italians were imported into Nuneaton and employed by hat makers, and supposing they agreed to work twelve or fourteen hours a day for 10s. a week, would not the English hatmakers very properly say "You are sweaters and blacklegs and we will not have it?" But these 100 Italians could go back to Italy and produce hats under precisely the same conditions, and the hats could be imported into this country free to compete with the hats produced under other conditions at Nuneaton. It would be better for the community that the Italians should be in Nuneaton, because they would be paying rates and taxes, spending money with the shopkeepers, and in a variety of other ways. He asked the hon. Member who represented the district if he could tell him the difference.

*MR. W. JOHNSON (Warwickshire, Nuneaton): I can only say that the hat manufacturers of Nuneaton and district have made large fortunes the last ten years.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS said he was not speaking of the master hat manufacturers who received 50 per cent. on their imported stuff, and in some cases more. They were making money, but how about the working men? He wanted an answer to the question. What was the difference between preventing sweated labour at home and welcoming the importation, without any import duty, of articles produced by sweated labour abroad? He had never been able to see the difference at all. While the free importation of foreign-made goods was going on, something far worse was happening in the removal of factories from this country to places abroad. That statement was challenged the other day. He did not know whether hon. Members had read the evidence given by gentlemen of the first standing in several trades before the Tariff Commission. From that evidence it appeared that the lace manufacturers of Nottingham, the manufacturers of Bradford and other parts of Yorkshire and Lancashire, were removing their factories to other countries. There was thus an exportation of capital, but the men were left behind. The labour of this country was destroyed by so-called free trade, and the working people of England were finding it out. In the not distant future the Labour leaders would have a very rude awakening. He could give many other instances showing how unfair foreign competition was injuring our trade, but he would only mention one. The making of packing cases was an important industry in this country. It employed thousands of men. The United States said to our manufacturers that if they sent their goods packed in cases made in America they would not charge duty on them. The consequence was that the packing case workmen, as in many other trades, were being done away with by this unfair competition.

Motion made, and Question, "That the debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Chiozza Money,*)—put, and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Adjourned at seven minutes after Eleven o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS.

*Tuesday*, 14*th May*, 1907.

The Earl of Liverpool sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven.

Also the Certificate that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with.—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Committed.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill.—Reported, without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.

General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill; Harrison's Patent Bill [H.L.]; Maidstone Gas Bill; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments.

London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill; North East London Railway Bill.—Reported, without Amendment.

St. Neots Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [H.L.]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [H.L.].—Read $3^a$. and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [H.L.]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3782. United States (California, Nevada, and Utah, and the territory of Arizona).

No. 3783. France (Calais).

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

I. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade authorising the construction of:—Light Railways in the borough of Mansfield and in the urban districts of Mansfield Woodhouse and of Sutton-in-the-Ashfield and in the rural district of Skegby, in the county of Nottingham, in extension of the Light Railways authorised by the Mansfield and District Light Railways Order, 1901, and for other purposes; A Light Railway in the West Riding of the County of York, from Sharow to Kirkby Malzeard; Light Railways in the urban district of Llanelly and in the rural district of Llanelly, in the county of Carmarthen; Light Railways in the West Riding of the County of York, from Ackworth to Kirk Smeaton.

II. Orders made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade amending:—The Dudley and District Light Railways Order, 1898, and the Dudley and District Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1900; The Brackenhill Light Railway Orders of 1901 and 1904; The Leicester and District Light Railways Order, 1904; The Robertsbridge and Pevensey Light Railway Orders of 1900 and 1903.

### MINES AND QUARRIES (EXPLOSION AT URPETH COLLIERY).

Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by J. B. Atkinson, M.Sc., one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, on the circumstances attending an explosion which occurred at Urpeth Colliery, near Birtley, Durham, on 17th December, 1906.

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

## RAILWAY RETURNS (PRELIMINARY STATEMENT).

Return relating to the railways of the United Kingdom, for the year 1906. Preliminary Statement.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

## POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).

Order made by the council of the West Riding of Yorkshire altering certain polling districts in the Sowerby, Barnsley, Doncaster, and Holmfirth Parliamentary Divisions.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act) and ordered to lie on the Table.

## FACTORY AND WORKSHOP BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, it will probably be for the convenience of the House if, before stating the provisions of the Bill which I have the honour to ask your Lordships to read a second time to-night, I say something about the history of this question, because that, I think, will go a long way towards explaining at once what are the intentions of His Majesty's Government in introducing this measure. The present position of laundries is that they are subject to the Factory and Workshop Act of 1895, which was introduced in another place by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. At that time he was anxious to subject all laundries to very much the same conditions as factories and workshops are subject to now; but, unfortunately, the majority which followed him in the other House then was not so large as it is at the present time. There was a combination of those interested in institutional laundries and those interested in commercial laundries, and they insisted upon the insertion of the clause under which laundries are now worked. The Home Secretary at that time foretold that it would not have satisfactory results, and I think all those who take an interest in industrial legislation are now quite agreed on that point.

Then in 1901 a large Bill dealing with all the various Acts, a Factory and Workshop Consolidating Bill, was introduced by Mr. Ritchie. That Bill had a curious history. There was considerable amendment in Grand Committee, and in the end Mr. Ritchie, on the Report stage, moved the omission of the whole of the laundry clause. That was agreed to by the House of Commons, and then the Bill came to this House. It reached your Lordships on 14th August, and was read a first time on that day. Then the Bill, with its 162 clauses was read a second time in your Lordships' House on the next day, and, having read it a second time, your Lordships suspended the Standing Order and proceeded to consider it in Committee. In Committee various appeals were made by the noble Earl, Lord Plymouth, and, I think, by the most rev. Primate, and by one or two other Peers, to Ministers to reinstate the clause which was originally in the Bill as the Government had introduced it in another place. The noble Lord who then represented the Home Office was, however, obdurate and explained that if such a thing were done it would be impossible to pass the Bill at all during that session. The only alternative, if the Bill was not allowed to go through as it stood, was that it would have to be dropped, and a large number of artisans throughout the country would lose the benefit of the Act. Accordingly, with very great regret, and after protests from both sides of the House, as well as from the Episcopal Bench, your Lordships agreed to that measure, and the Bill, with the somewhat technical addition of the clause from the 1895 Act, was passed. The Committee stage having been finished on the same day, your Lordships read the Bill a third time and passed it, and it was then returned to another place. I hope that when in future we are told that His Majesty's Government do not allow sufficient time for the discussion of Bills in this House, the passage of the Factory and Workshop Act of 1901 will be remembered as a standard of the way in which the late Government used to deal with your Lordships' House.

But in the passage of that Bill through this House the noble and learned Lord, Lord James of Hereford, promised that

His Majesty's Government would, at the earliest opportunity, take steps to deal with the question of laundries. For various reasons the late Government did not see their way to deal with it at once, and I think there were good reasons why certainly for two or three years after that they should not have dealt with laundries. But last year, as your Lordships may remember, the Government were urged to bring in a Bill dealing with the question, and they gave a pledge that they would, if possible, do so, and the Bill which is now before your Lordships is the result.

Perhaps I should say, briefly, why it is that the present condition of the law relating to laundries is so unsatisfactory. The clause in the Act of 1895, which was re-enacted in the 1901 Act, allows a great deal too much latitude in regard to both commercial laundries and institutional laundries; in fact, the latter go without inspection at all. Commercial laundries are obliged to fix in the laundry a statement of the hours between which employment takes place, but that, in practice, is not found to be sufficient. In the ordinary factory or workshop the employer is not allowed to change the hours more than once every three months, but in a laundry, under the present law, he can change his time table every day, so long as he puts up the new time table before the beginning of the day's work. The result is that, whereas in the case of the ordinary factory the inspector knows at what hour to visit the factory to find out whether the rule is being observed or not, it is impossible for him to say, with regard to a laundry, what is the hour at which he ought to visit.

Then the latitude which is given to commercial laundries is very considerable in various other directions, and the method in which His Majesty's Government propose to deal with the question is, as your Lordships will see in the first clause, to bring all laundries under the Factory and Workshop Act of 1901. There is this difference between the factory and the workshop, that those are factories in which there is power used, and those are workshops in which no power is used. That is a rough definition which I think is sufficient for the present purposes. One great alteration follows from this clause. It is that all tenement laundries will be inspected whether there are two or fewer employed in the laundry. There has been, I understand, an increase of this tenement system by which the power is created at one end of a long row of houses and communicated right through at the back, and in each of these tenement houses very few people indeed are employed, perhaps only the people who live in the house. These will be inspected in the future although they have not been inspected in the past. In fact, the result of this clause will be to subject all laundries to inspection in exactly the same way as all factories and workshops are inspected at the present time; that is to say, laundresses will be put on the same footing as dressmakers, milliners, and persons who follow such occupations.

The second clause deals with the conditions which His Majesty Government offer to these commercial laundries, and which your Lordships will see afford them certain advantages which they would not have if they worked directly under the current Act of 1901. There are obvious reasons why laundries should be allowed latitude of this kind. The ordinary British householder, I believe, insists on the linen being back on Friday night, and, as a rule, it is not collected till Monday. That makes a considerable rush of work during the middle of the week, and it is not possible to distribute the work equally over all the working days. Therefore, although in this clause it is forbidden that the hours of work should consist of more than sixty-eight, including intervals for meals, there will be a certain latitude so that they may work more hours on one day and make it up by working fewer hours on another day. Your Lordships will see that the next clause will apply to all laundries. In the last Act the two sections (*b*) and (*c*), with regard to inspection of stoves for heating and the keeping of floors in good condition, did not apply to laundries if there was no power used. But now His Majesty's Government are of opinion that they should be brought into line in this matter.

Then we come to the second part of this Bill, dealing with institutional laundries, and on that I may perhaps refer your Lordships to a deputation which was received by the Home Secretary a short time ago on which there were represented, I think, all the various institutions—reformatories, and so on—in which laundry work is carried on. It is chiefly carried on by Roman Catholics and by the Church of England. Mr. Gladstone has been anxious, if he could, to put such provisions in this Bill as would meet their wishes. I do not know that it is necessary for me this evening to trouble your Lordships by going through the whole of the five clauses, but I think I may say generally that it is the wish and the intention of the Secretary of State to do all he can to meet the very legitimate desires of the managers of these institutions, by making special arrangements for them which will enable them to carry on work which is not only of an educational kind, but also of a kind calculated to improve the characters and generally the welfare of the inmates of these institutions.

It is obvious, I am sure, to your Lordships that a great number of these institutions must be carried on on somewhat different lines from ordinary commercial laundries, and it is certainly the intention of His Majesty's Government to go as far as they think they can fairly go in the direction of meeting the wishes of those who are experienced in the management of these institutions. I venture to think that we may hope for this Bill a smooth passage, both through this House and another place. It has been printed for some time, and there has not, at any rate yet, been any sign that it is objected to by those who are engaged in this industry; and since employers do not seem to regard it with any disfavour I trust your Lordships will give it a Second Reading to-day, and I have no doubt that, if it is passed into law, it will be of considerable advantage to those who are employed in this industry

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Earl Beauchamp*).

*THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I should like to be allowed to say a few words on this subject. The story of this measure is an odd one, and it affords a curious example of how what may seem like a comparatively small matter may be found to involve issues which materially and gravely complicate the actual working of our legislative machinery. It is not very easy to explain in a word, nor is it necessary to do it now, why it has been found that the incorporation of laundries under the ordinary regulations of our factory legislation is an exceedingly troublesome and difficult thing.

The noble Earl who has so clearly introduced the Bill to your Lordships' notice to-day has explained in some measure what the past history of these difficulties has been. It has to be remembered that in 1895, when Mr. Asquith carried his Bill through the House of Commons, he quite openly professed himself dissatisfied with the clause in that Act—the clause which survives in substance as the law to-day—dealing with laundries; and when in 1901 the matter came up again while he was in opposition no one was more outspoken than he in saying that the Government ought to have been able to carry the matter through. The noble Earl has referred to the pathetic scene which took place in this House in 1901, when tears were almost brought to our eyes by Lord James of Hereford's appeal to us as to the disasters which would follow if anything were done to touch the Bill of 162 clauses which was then presented to your Lordships with the knowledge that unless it were read a third time within twenty-four hours it would not become law and the whole country would suffer in consequence. The noble Earl has called attention to that to show that it is not on one side of the House only, but on both sides, that difficulties are experienced in securing time for adequate consideration of important measures in this House. Mr. Asquith, in the appeal which he made at that time against the action of the Government, put it thus. He said—

> "I was unable in 1895 to carry this through in its proper form because we had not an adequate majority. Now the present Government have an adequate majority."

He explained that he had been obliged to whittle down his clause in 1895, because he had not the advantage of a great and permanent majority, and he pointed out that Mr. Ritchie had a large majority quite capable of overcoming any forces that might be arrayed against him. I should like those words to be borne in mind when this Bill goes to the House of Commons, should the Government say they are obliged, if objection is brought against it, to whittle down the legislation which they think necessary.

Most of the difficulty in dealing with laundries by legislation arises from the fact that the work they perform is found to be the most suitable kind of work for philanthropic institutions, the main object of which is not the making of money, but the reform of their inmates. That complicates the matter considerably and accounts in a large measure, though not, I think, altogether, for the difficulty which has arisen. I was very glad to hear the noble Earl in charge of the Bill say that those institutions will no longer be allowed to stand in the way of the reform which is needed in the conditions under which the industry generally is carried on. For myself, I have from the first always failed to understand the objection raised in some quarters by the supporters of these institutions to inspection. I have always urged inspection. I think the inspection of these institutions is not only possible, but proper and right. Every institution with which I have any connection, and they are many, at once took advantage of the offer made by the Home Office in 1902, that if institutions wished it, inspectors would be sent to inspect them. I welcome something stronger than that. I desire that such inspection should be universal and compulsory. The fact that some of the institutions which carry on laundry work declined to take advantage of the offer of the Home Office, and therefore are at this moment not inspected, is to my mind the strongest proof of the necessity which exists that some more stringent clause such as this Bill contains, should find a place on the Statute Book.

It may be said that, if it be only these charitable institutions that block the way to reform of the conditions under which laundry work is carried on, why should we not leave institutional laundries out of consideration altogether and deal with commercial laundries only? Such a course would be exceedingly unfair to commercial laundries. These laundries maintain that even now charitable institutions have some advantage over them. I do not agree with that; but there can be no doubt that if stringent restrictions are now applied to commercial laundries and none to charitable laundries, commercial laundries will have a strong reason to complain of disparity of treatment. That is the reason why we cannot separate the two classes of laundries. I hold that charitable institutions need inspection, and that they gain from the help which such inspection gives. Therefore, for everybody's sake I most earnestly hope that some such provision as finds its place in this Bill may very speedily become law. At the same time I think it is indisputable that there must be some special arrangements in connection with the laundries managed by charitable institutions. Anyone who will look into the details will find that to apply to institutional laundries *verbatim et literatim* the rules which are applicable to ordinary commercial laundries would have consequences quite other than those which the Legislature desires, and that some modifications to meet their special and different conditions are absolutely necessary.

It is of very great interest to read the reports by those inspectors, male or female, who have inspected the institutions which voluntarily asked for it under the Home Office circular of 1902. There are very ample reports given by some of those who conducted these inspections, and I doubt whether anyone would rise from reading those reports without seeing that, with the best possible intention to act rightly, the managers of these institutions require the help which inspection gives. For example, most of the laundries connected with charitable institutions were started in days when the work was not done by machinery at all. The introduction of machinery has resulted in this: that a large number of excellent and devoted ladies find themselves called upon to supervise work which involves the use of complicated machinery without having anyone to tell them how to do it, and if it were not tragic it would be laughable to read the accounts in regard to this which are given by the inspectors. They quote instances to show how girls too stupid for anything else have been set to work the machinery, and this, of course, is liable to result in numerous accidents. I submit that inspection, wanted always, is more and more required as mechanical means are applied to these institutions.

While I thoroughly give my support to the Second Reading of this Bill, there are a good many points which I am anxious we should carefully consider in Committee. When I remember the speeches which have been made by Mr. Asquith and others about what ought to be done, I feel that the Bill ought to go a little further. It seems to me, for example, that under Clause 5 (2) (*d*)—

> "(*d*) The provisions of the principal Act as to sending notices to the inspector shall not apply, except so far as an order made by the Secretary of State may otherwise direct"—

it might be possible for an institution, by merely never sending in any notice at all, to escape inspection altogether. I have no doubt that if that is the result of the wording it is accidental. At all events, it is a result which cannot be intended, and it is desirable that the point should be looked into. Then I have some suspicion about the subsection which allows the ordinary medical officer of the institution, I suppose whether the authorities like it or not, provided the institution desires it, to be appointed the certifying surgeon for the institution. No doubt that can subsequently be explained. It is a question of the interpretation of the word "may," which, as we all know, frequently means "shall" in an Act of Parliament.

Then in the final clauses of the Bill there are provisions into which I am anxious we should look closely. We know how difficult it is to regulate executive work where the different Departments of the State overlap one another, and there is some amount of overlapping between functions belonging to the Local Government Board and functions belonging to the Home Office when we are dealing with this question. There are institutions now inspected by officials of the Local Government Board which have connected with them buildings and workshops which properly fall under factory inspection, and should therefore come under the Home Office; but, presumably on the ground of avoiding overlapping and possible jealousy between the two Departments, it is provided, as I understand the Bill, that where there is such an institution it shall be possible for the Local Government Board inspector to be the person to examine the factory department of that institution. A great many of the inspectors under the Local Government Board, who are admirably qualified for examining and inspecting philanthropic and other institutions, have no knowledge whatever such as would enable them to inspect adequately places in which complicated machinery is used, and which fall properly to the factory inspector. That is a point which requires looking into if we are to be sure that the inspection is to be carried out as it ought to be.

These, of course, are all points which will have to be dealt with in Committee. I rose, on behalf of those who in the Church of England are responsible for our philanthropic and charitable institutions to which laundries are attached, to say how cordially I welcome the Bill, how earnestly I hope its provisions will be strengthened, and how gladly I, for one, shall co-operate in making inspection universal.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON: My Lords, having had occasion to introduce this subject to your Lordships in previous years, I should like to make a few remarks on the Bill which has just been introduced by the noble Earl. In the first place I would like to congratulate His Majesty's Government on having so speedily fulfilled the promise they made last session to introduce such a Bill at the earliest opportunity. It is now thirty years since a Royal Commission first suggested that laundries should be brought within the Factory Act, and, in view of the fact that since that time everybody who has had anything to do with the actual administration of the existing law has testified to the inadequacy of it, one may fairly say that this measure of reform has been long overdue. I should like to express my great pleasure that the Government have dealt with the two classes of hitherto exempted laundries—namely, institution laundries and the smaller laundries in which only two persons are employed. As far as its general principles and objects are concerned the Bill follows very much the same lines as the one which I had the honour to introduce to your Lordships five years ago, and which passed through all its stages without a Division. But in respect of the machinery by which those objects are carried out, this Bill differs from that one in several important details. It differs from it, I think, in some respects so unfortunately that some of its details diminish considerably the pleasure which I feel at the introduction of the Bill. Such criticisms as I have to make of those details will be more suitable to the Committee stage, but it would perhaps be convenient if I indicated briefly at this moment the points upon which I think this Bill will need some Amendment.

The object of the Bill, as the noble Earl explained, is to apply the provisions of the Factory Act to all commercial laundries and also to provide for the inspection and regulation of laundries attached to certain charitable institutions. Clause 2 is the one which deals with commercial laundries, and the various paragraphs of Sub-section (1) deal with the hours of employment and the amount of overtime to be worked. Under the provisions of this sub-section the proprietor of a laundry may choose to work under Section 49 of the principal Act, or he may adopt Paragraph (*b*) of this clause. If he chooses the latter, Paragraph (*b*) would enable him to work overtime on three days in every week, except Saturday, provided that a corresponding reduction is made in the periods of employment on other days of the week. I would like to draw your Lordships' special attention to these words, because they are new to factory legislation. Though the principle may be perfectly fair and reasonable I submit that it will prove to be unworkable in practice.

The principle which has always been adopted in factory legislation hitherto is that those regulations which deal with overtime should be so framed that an inspector can tell the moment he enters any premises whether the law is being carried out or not, and the introduction of these words will make it difficult for an inspector to carry out his duties. There is no provision made in the Bill that notice should be given to the Home Office of the overtime which is to be worked on any particular day or of the corresponding reductions which are to be made on other days. I understand that the Government are relying upon Section 60 and Section 32 of the principal Act, which are supposed to govern the sending of notices with regard to overtime allowed under this clause. It is very difficult to understand a Bill of this sort. This is another case of legislation by reference, and it is extremely difficult for any one reading the Bill to know exactly what it does and what it does not do. We shall have to go very carefully into this in Committee to see how the question of notice is dealt with, and I hope the Government will then explain on what sections of the principal Act they are relying in this matter. It appears to me that under this Bill an inspector might go into a laundry, and, finding overtime being worked there, might lodge a complaint, and be then answered by the proprietor that he was going to make up the overtime by corresponding reductions on other days. There is no provision that the corresponding reductions are to be notified before the overtime is worked. If however, this is provided for in the principal Act it seems to me that even then it would be extremely difficult for a laundry to meet its emergency work if its proprietor had to say beforehand upon what days emergencies would arise necessitating the working of overtime, and on what other days the corresponding reductions would be made. The noble Earl, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, explained how very complicated and difficult to enforce the existing law is, and I am afraid that if the Government adhere to the provisions of this clause as it stands, its administration in the future will be attended by no less confusion and even more friction.

As to the question of the institution laundries which come under Clause 5, here, again, I fear that the machinery which is set up in this Bill will to a large extent defeat the object of the Government in introducing it. Sub-section (2) of Clause 5, for instance, provides that the managers of any institution may submit for the approval of the Secretary of State a scheme for the regulation of the hours of employment, intervals for meals, and holidays of the workers, and that scheme may take the place of the corresponding provisions in the principal Act, if the Secretary of State is satisfied that the provisions of the scheme are on the whole not less favourable than the corresponding provisions. Your Lordships will understand what an enormous amount of extra labour will be placed on the Home Office by this. Some Home Office official will have to investigate every scheme sent in by the different institutions, and will have to decide whether they are more or less favourable than the corresponding provisions of the principal Act. We are often told that the Home Office is at present doing work which in other countries is entrusted to two, if not three, Departments, and I am surprised that the Government should go out of their way to place fresh burdens on this already overworked Department. I am not using this argument in the interests of the Home Office. That Department can safely be left to look after its own interests; but I have a fear lest if the Home Office should prove unable, through pressure of work, properly to check all the schemes put forward on behalf of institutional laundries, these institutions will not be adequately regulated. I think it would be a much better system to lay down in general terms what are the exemptions which, in consequence of their special character, ought to be allowed to these institutions, and then to apply the Factory Act to them as a whole.

There is one other point, to which the most rev. Primate alluded. I refer to the words in the beginning of Clause 5, which exempt from factory inspection any laundry connected with an institution which is at present inspected by or is under the authority of any Government Department. These words will exclude all laundries attached to reformatories, workhouses, orphanages, industrial schools, and so forth, which are at the present moment in respect of their other work under the authority of either the Board of Education or the Local Government Board. I believe it is customary in legislation of this kind to exclude the work of one Department from interference by another Department, and as a general principle that may be a very sound rule to adopt; but I submit that when you are dealing with laundries where dangerous and complicated machinery is used it is imperative that they should be inspected by the only Department which is competent to do it. If it were only a question of needlework and occupations where no machinery is employed though technically a workshop the inspection can well be carried out by the Department to which the institution belongs. But with laundries it is different, and it does seem to me that machinery cannot properly be inspected either by an education officer or a sanitary inspector. I know, for instance, of a case in which feeble-minded children in an industrial school were placed in charge of laundry machinery attached to that institution; and of another case in which a woman in a workhouse lost her arm in an unguarded machine in a laundry attached to the institution. The mutilated woman remained in the workhouse, but the machine was not encased. It will surely be admitted that if an institution of this kind is engaged in work which necessitates the use of dangerous machinery, that part of its work ought to be under the inspection and authority of the Department whose business it is to inspect machinery. My Lords, these are points which will require to be considered in Committee. I hope, therefore, that your Lordships will examine the clauses of the Bill very closely when we reach that stage, and that you will consent to insert some Amendments at any rate into the Bill before it is carried into law.

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Bill read 2ª accordingly, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House on Tuesday the 4th of June next.

## COMPANIES BILL [H.L.].

Report of Amendments received.

Clause 11:—

The Earl of GRANARD said the object of his Amendment to this clause was simply to impose a penalty, by reference to the Companies Act, 1862, on every director and officer of a company who refused to allow the inspection of a register of mortgages.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 11, page 10, line 24, to leave out from the word 'company,' to the word 'provided' in line 26, and to insert the words, 'in like manner as the register of mortgages under section forty-three of the Companies Act, 1862, and the provisions of that section (including the penal provisions thereof) shall apply accordingly.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 17:—

Lord AVEBURY moved to amend this clause, which dealt with the power to re-issue redeemed debentures in certain cases, by adding, after the words—

"Where either before or after the passing of this Act a company has redeemed any debentures previously issued."

the words—

"Or reissued under this Section."

He said he had placed this Amendment on the Paper on behalf of the Central Association of Bankers, who were advised by their legal representatives that the words ought to be inserted in order to carry out the intentions of His Majesty's Government.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 9, after the word 'issued,' to insert the words 'or re-issued under this section.'"—(*Lord Avebury*).

The Earl of GRANARD said the legal advisers of the Board of Trade were of opinion that the section as it at present stood covered the point raised by the noble Lord. In these circumstances, he hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Lord AVEBURY explained that the Central Association of Bankers were advised that the words in his next Amendment were also necessary to carry out what was understood to be the intention of His Majesty's Government. He begged to move.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 13, after the word 'do' to insert the words 'contained in such debentures or in any trust deed securing the same.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

The Earl of GRANARD said the point raised by the noble Lord would be dealt with in an Amendment which he (Lord Granard) would next move—viz.: to insert, instead of the words proposed by Lord Avebury, the following words—

"and not being an obligation enforceable only by the person to whom the redeemed debentures were issued."

The object of the Government was to secure the protection of second debenture holders or other subsequent creditors.

Lord AVEBURY said that if the noble Earl thought his words met the case better he was prepared to leave the matter in his hands.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The Earl of GRANARD then moved the Amendment to which he had referred.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 13, after the word 'do' to insert the words 'and not being an obligation enforceable only by the person to whom the redeemed debentures were issued.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord AVEBURY moved to omit the following proviso at the end of Subsection (1) of Clause 17—

"Provided that nothing in this section shall prejudice the operation of any judgment or order of a court of competent jurisdiction pronounced or made before the seventh day of March one thousand nine hundred and seven as between the parties to the proceedings in which the judgment was pronounced or the order made, and any appeal from any such judgment or order shall be decided as if this Act had not been passed."

In his opinion the words would come in better later on. He understood that that was also the view of the Government.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 22, to leave out from the word 'issued' to the end of Subsection (1)."—(*Lord Avebury*).

THE EARL OF GRANARD accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY said the insertion of the words which he proposed was in accordance with Amendments which had been introduced in other parts of the Bill. He believed the Amendment had the approval of the noble Earl in charge of the Bill.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 31, after the word 'have' to insert the words 'whether before or after the passing of this Act.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD accepted the Amendment, which he said was necessary in order to make it clear that the clause was intended to be retrospective. He had an Amendment on the Paper to the same effect.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved an Amendment to Subsection (3). This subsection ran—

"(3) Where a company has deposited any of its debentures to secure a current account, the debentures shall not be deemed to have been redeemed by reason only of the current account having, whilst the debentures were so deposited, been in credit."

His Amendment was to omit the words "a current account," and to insert the words "an advance. The clause as it stood would only apply to advances by bankers. In many cases companies obtained advances from insurance companies, and it would be very hard if they were precluded, as they would be unless his Amendment were accepted, from going to insurance companies for advances. Moreover, insurance companies would be deprived of a profitable business. But, more important still, a company would be deprived of the guarantee of the validity of debentures. If a company had deposited debentures with a bank and had redeemed them, those debentures would be perfectly good; but, unless his Amendment were accepted, they would not be good if they had been deposited with an insurance company and subsequently redeemed. It would be impossible for an ordinary purchaser in the open market to determine whether or not a debenture was good, because it would be impossible to ascertain whether it had been deposited with an insurance company for an advance, in which case it would be bad.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 35, to leave out the words, 'a current account,' and to insert the words 'an advance.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN) said that this Amendment and two other Amendments which were consequential had only just been handed to him. They were not on the Paper, and therefore he had not had an opportunity of examining them critically; but, as far as he could see, the Amendments seemed to be in the right direction. The purpose of the noble Lord was to secure that a debenture should not be vitiated by reason of any advance being repaid. That appeared to be sound, and he would accept the Amendment, reserving to himself the right to reconsider the point on further inquiry.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Consequential Amendments agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY said his next Amendment was a purely technical one. It did not alter the Bill in any way, but he was advised that the words were desirable in order to carry out the intentions of the Government. He would not, however, press the Amendment if the words were considered unnecessary.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, line 37, after the word 'credit,' to insert the words, 'or cease to be in debit, nor shall other holders of debentures ot the same series or class or any subsequent encumbrancers be entitled to treat payments into such account as in reduction of the amount for which the debentures in security may rank as against such other holders or subsequent encumbrancers.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD said that, so far as the Government were concerned, they accepted the principle of the first part of the Amendment, but not the second part, which would create an exception in the general law of mortgage in favour of a particular class. For this reason it would be inadvisable for the Government to agree to the Amendment.

LORD ALVERSTONE submitted that something of the kind was required, but agreed that the words in the Amendment as they stood would not do. With regard to the latter part of the Amendment, there was, he thought, some necessity for a proviso to meet that case.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he had some misgivings on the point. It seemed to him that the effect of the Amendment would be to violate what he regarded as a very fair rule. Therefore, while he was prepared to consider it, he at present inclined to the view that it could not be accepted.

LORD AVEBURY said that if the noble and learned Lord would consider the point he would not press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD AVEBURY moved the insertion of a new subsection to meet a case, which, he said, was more common in the country than in London, in which debentures were issued in blank. It had been pressed upon him very strongly from the country that words of this kind were desirable.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, page 12, after Subsection (3) to insert the following new subsection:—(4) 'The foregoing provisions shall *mutatis mutandis* apply and be deemed to have applied not only to debentures or debenture stock issued as completed securities, but also to debentures or certificates for debenture stock deposited or issued in blank with or without power to fill up the blanks, and to provisional certificates for debentures or debenture stock.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the object of the Amendment seemed to be that in cases where there had not been what in ordinary parlance was called an issue, but where there had been debentures or certificates for stock deposited in blank, the fact that the debt had been paid off should not vitiate the debentures. He thought the Amendment was unnecessary, on the ground that it had been decided, and rightly decided, that a transaction with debentures of that kind was, in fact, an issue, and, accordingly, would fall within the provisions stated earlier in the Bill, which prevented the issue of debentures being vitiated by the process in question.

LORD ALVERSTONE entirely agreed with the Lord Chancellor, but asked the noble and learned Lord to consider, in connection with this matter, the last words of the Amendment. He doubted very much whether the cases referred to applied to provisional certificates for debentures.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he would give the point his attention. It might be that it would require consideration.

LORD AVEBURY stated that as this was a highly technical point he would leave it in the hands of the Lord Chancellor.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

LORD AVEBURY moved the re-insertion of the proviso which had been deleted from an earlier part of the clause.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided that nothing in this section shall prejudice the operation of any judgment or order of a court of competent jurisdiction pronounced or made before the seventh day of March one thousand nine hundred and seven as between the parties to the proceedings in which the judgment was pronounced or the order made, and any appeal from any such judgment or order shall be decided as if this Act had not been passed.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved an addition to the proviso just added to the clause.

Amendment moved—

"In Clause 17, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided also that nothing herein contained shall derogate from or prejudice any power to issue debentures in the place of any debentures paid off or otherwise satisfied or extinguished reserved to a company by its debentures or the securities of the same.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 21:

LORD AVEBURY reminded their Lordships that there was some discussion on this clause when the Bill was in Committee, and said that one or two noble Lords imagined that he was proposing to leave out an obligation on the part of the company to give notice to the shareholders when there was proposed to be any change of auditor. But the real effect of the clause, as it stood, was that unless the directors chose to give such notice there could be no change of auditor. If his Amendment were agreed to the subsection would read—

"A person, other than a retiring auditor, shall not be capable of being appointed auditor at an annual general meeting unless notice of an intention to nominate that person to the office of auditor has been given by the nominator to the company not less than fourteen days before the annual general meeting, and the company shall, at the expense of the nominator, send such notice to every shareholder and to the retiring auditors not less than seven days before the annual general meeting."

He understood that the noble Earl in charge of the Bill was prepared to accept the Amendment with the exception of the words requiring that the notice should be given "at the expense of the nominator." Unless the notice were given at the expense of the nominator anyone might nominate an enterprising young man as auditor to a particular company and therefore impose on the company the unnecessary expense of sending a notice to every shareholder advertising the person nominated. It was agreed that, if the proposed auditor should be elected, then the expense of the notice should be borne by the company; but he did not think companies should be put to the expense of sending round notices of the nomination of an auditor who had really no chance of being elected.

Amendment proposed—

"In Clause 21, page 14, line 23, after the word 'days' to insert the words 'before the annual general meeting,' and leave out the word 'by,' and after the word 'company' to insert the words 'shall, at the expense of the nominator, send such notice,' and after the word 'shareholder' to insert the words 'and to the retiring auditors.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD said the Government were not prepared, without further consideration, to accept the words "at the expense of the nominator." They thought it rather hard that, in the case of a shareholder wishing to nominate an auditor, all the expense should be borne by him. The Government proposed to submit several of the points that had been raised to the Committee on whose recommendations the Bill had been drafted, and this point would be one of those referred for consideration.

LORD ALVERSTONE suggested that the question of notice being given to retiring auditors should also be considered. It was a small matter, but he thought the provision might lead to canvassing and other undesirable results.

*LORD FABER did not like the idea that the shareholders who proposed an auditor should have to pay for the issuing of the notices. In the case of a very large company the expense would be almost prohibitive, and, therefore, it would come to this, that the auditor would only be proposed by the company. As the auditor was appointed for the protection of the shareholders this would be a very awkward result. He agreed that it would be hard on a company if a shareholder, in a frivolous spirit, proposed an unfit person as auditor, but of the two difficulties he thought they had better face the second.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he was prepared to agree with Lord Faber, but, as the Board of Trade wished to consult the Committee on this and kindred points, he thought it would be best to allow them to do so.

LORD AVEBURY said he was quite ready to leave the point in question to be considered by the Committee, and he moved his Amendment without the words "at the expense of the nominator."

Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved the insertion of a new sub-section dealing with the question of auditors. He said it had been held in some cases that the auditors named in the prospectus had not really been appointed at all, and therefore some such provision as that contained in his Amendment was obviously necessary.

Amendment proposed—

" In Clause 21, page 14, line 32, after the word ' pounds ' to insert as a new subsection :—" (6) Where in any prospectus issued by a company any person is named as the auditor, the said person shall, unless he resign the appointment, continue to be the auditor of the said company until the first annual general meeting succeeding the issue thereof.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD said he would be obliged if the noble Lord would not press the Amendment. The whole subject would go before the Committee, and the Government would act on their recommendation.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Drafting Amendments agreed to.

Clause 41 :

LORD AVEBURY moved to omit the words " independently of the presence or votes of any shareholders or any other class " from the following proviso—

" But provided always that no preference or special privilege attached to or belonging to any class of shares shall be interfered with except by a resolution passed and confirmed by shareholders of that class, independently of the presence or votes of any shareholders of any other other class, and every resolution so passed shall be a valid special resolution binding all shareholders of such class."

As the clause stood, the holder of preference shares could not vote upon a matter affecting ordinary shares, and *vice versa* ; but, unless the words which he proposed to delete were omitted, a person who held both classes of shares would not be able to vote at all.

Amendment proposed—

" In Clause 41, page 20, lines 40 and 41, to leave out the words ' independently of the presence or votes of any shareholders of any other class.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD said the Government thought the Amendment of the noble Lord greatly improved the clause, and they had much pleasure in accepting it.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved to insert a new clause after Clause 46. He explained that the object was to secure that all extraordinary resolutions should be filed with the Registrar in like manner as special resolutions.

Amendment proposed—

" After Clause 46, to insert as a new clause : ' An extraordinary resolution for the purposes of the Companies Act, 1862, and this Act, means a resolution which is passed in such manner as would, if it had been confirmed by a subsequent meeting, have constituted a special resolution, and section fifty-three of the Companies Act, 1862, shall apply in the case of an extraordinary resolution in like manner as that section applies in the case of a special resolution, with the substitution of a reference to the date of the passing of the extraordinary resolution for the reference to the date of the confirmation of the special resolution.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 50 :

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH asked the Lord Chancellor, before the Bill finally left their Lordships' House, to reconsider the subsection which he (Lord Balfour) had suggested should be added to Clause 50, but which the noble and learned Lord desired should not be pressed at a former stage. The proposed new subsection to which he referred read—

" The provisions of this Act with respect to the registration of mortgages and charges shall not apply to companies registered in Scotland."

The noble and learned Lord refused to accept that subsection when the Bill was in Committee. The point he wished the Lord Chancellor most carefully to consider was whether or not the clauses headed " Mortgages and Charges " (11 to 20 inclusive) would apply to Scotland. If they did so apply, Scottish companies would be put to serious and unnecessary expense. There was no doubt that at present mortgages and charges created by limited companies had not to be registered with the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies in Scotland, but such mortgages and charges were already registered under the law of Scotland in the Register of Sasines, and it would be unfair to make a second registration necessary. Section 34 (2) of the Act of 1900 provided that the provisions of that Act with respect to the registration of mortgages and charges should not apply to companies registered in Scotland. This subsection was inserted on the Report Stage of that Bill, and the insertion was due to the sudden discovery that under the Scottish law there were not, and never could be, any floating charges the iniquities of which were so eloquently denounced by Lord Lindley and which it was intended to put a stop to. Section 14 of the Act of 1900 containing the principal provisions as to the registration of mortgages and charges was repealed by this Bill, and there was some doubt whether the saving clause for Scotland would or would not apply to the new provisions in this Bill. Great importance was attached to Scotland being excluded from the provisions of this Bill as to registration of mortgages and charges, and he hoped that point would have the careful consideration of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he would consider the point. The mischief against which the registration of mortgages by companies was directed was that people dealing with companies which had a limited liability sometimes found, when they tried to enforce their claims, that there were mortgages which had been undisclosed to the public, and the disclosure of which would have prevented any person giving the company credit. As soon as the unfortunate creditor attempted to enforce his claim for a just debt down came the mortgagor, who was often the promoter of the company, and swept off all the assets under a mortgage which no one had ever heard of. That was a flagrant and a great wrong, and clauses had been inserted in this Bill to secure that there should always be publicity in regard to any such transactions, so that no one should be cheated in consequence of the apparent prosperity of a company which was, in fact, mortgaged up to the hilt. The registration of mortgages and charges on heritable property was required under the Scottish law, but the mortgages to which he had referred had no connection with heritable property. They referred to book debts, uncalled capital, and so forth; and the result was that the registration of heritable property only would not provide the necessary security. He wished to know whether it was desired that companies in Scotland should not be obliged to register mortgages on movable property. If that was the real wish of the people of Scotland, well and good; but he thought they ought to be satisfied, in the face of the great mischief to which he had alluded, that this was the wish of the people of Scotland before inserting any such provision. For himself he would not, in this matter, accept the view of the legal profession, for this was a part of high public policy. If Lord Balfour would elucidate that matter he would be very grateful to him, and would promise the best consideration to any view put forward.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said that so far as mortgages and charges on heritable property were concerned there was nothing between them. But his information went to show that in Scotland no effective mortgage or charge could be given upon assets remaining in the hands of a company such as could be created in England by a mortgage or charge on uncalled capital, a bill of sale, or a floating charge; and registration of charges other than those affecting heritage, already provided for, was therefore unnecessary. If that was right it was clear that this part of the Bill should not apply to Scotland. His information came from those who had carefuly considered the matter, and not from company promoters or persons against whom the Bill was directed. He hoped the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack would ascertain for himself whether the law was as he (Lord Balfour) had stated it.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of ONSLOW) said he had carefully abstained from rising until the noble Lord had resumed his seat. But a Committee of their Lordships' House had been appointed to consider the question of order in debate, and he would be greatly surprised if that Committee did not find that it was out of order for a noble Lord to address the House more than once on Report.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH agreed that he had been out of order in speaking again on the same matter, but said it would be in the recollection of the House that the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack had appealed to him for information. But for that fact he would not have risen again.

THE Lord PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON) said the noble Earl the Lord Chairman was quite right. Their Lordships had got so demoralised in consequence of the latitude during the discussions on the Education Bill last year that they appeared to have forgotten the rule of the House. He only rose to press upon their Lordships the fact that the rule was that no Peer could speak more than once on the Report Stage.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: My Lords, I hope I shall not be out of order if I say one word about this Bill now that it is through Report. I have been asked whether it is possible that the Third Reading could be taken the day after to-morrow. That request is made on the ground that it would be possible to find a really early day in the House of Commons before this House meets again after the Whitsuntide recess. It would be a great convenience if your Lordships would agree to this course, and it would enable us to get on with the Bill. If the House will consent to that I will promise my noble friend Lord Balfour that the point he raised shall be fully considered with a view to its being dealt with in the House of Commons.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I most readily respond to the appeal of the noble and learned Lord. I am sure it is a matter which he could deal with in consultation with others much better than on the Third Reading in this House.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: In the ordinary circumstances, considering that the Bill this evening has been dealt with somewhat freely and without the House having always a full opportunity of knowing what was proposed, I think we should have asked for a longer period in which to reconsider the Bill in its amended form. But I understand that the Bill receives the consent of your Lordships on both sides and that some of my noble friends behind me, who have taken a closer interest in it than we have been able to take, are in favour of the course proposed by the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack. If that is so, we on this Bench shall raise no objection to that course being taken.

LORD AVEBURY: I quite agree to the course proposed, and I should like to thank the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack and Lord Granard for the courtesy with which they have met the Amendments that have been suggested.

Bill to be read 3ª on Thursday next, and to be printed as amended. (No. 55.)

---

## THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS, who had given notice "To call attention to the Answers given by the Under-Secretary for War to Questions addressed to him on Monday the 29th of April last regarding the 'hoped for' 'speculative' Territorial Army; and further, to give the Answers to the Questions to which the Under-Secretary failed to reply," said: My Lords, I have been asked by my noble friend Lord Portsmouth to postpone the Notice standing in my name until after Whitsuntide. I shall be very glad to do so.

### MATRIMONIAL CAUSES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

### PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.]; EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order): Bills reported without Amendment: Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª to-morrow.

### MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATION BILL [H.L.

LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, in the absence of my noble friend Lord Courtney of Penwith, I beg to move the Motion standing in his name on the Paper.

Moved, That the following Lords be named of the Select Committee—

E. Hardwicke.
E. Cathcart.
E. Beauchamp.
L. Colchester.
L. Monteagle of Brandon.
L. Belper.
L. Ampthill.
L. Avebury.
L. Haversham.
L. Pirrie.
L. Courtney of Penwith.
L. Allendale.

—(*Lord Avebury.*)

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I had been given to understand that one of the right rev. Prelates desired to serve on this Committee. The suggestion seemed an excellent one, and if that desire is still felt on the Episcopal Bench we might substitute the name of a Bishop for one of the names in the Motion.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: The only difficulty is that Lord Courtney is not here. It is his Motion and his Committee.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: But he has placed himself in Lord Avebury's hands.

LORD AVEBURY: I speak for my noble friend, and I am quite prepared to move the Motion without the name of Lord Pirrie. The name of a right rev. Prelate could be added at a subsequent stage.

On Question, Motion, as amended, agreed to, and the Lords following were named of the Select Committee—

E. Hardwicke.
E. Cathcart.
E. Beauchamp.
L. Colchester.
L. Monteagle of Brandon.
L. Belper.
L. Ampthill.
L. Avebury.
L. Haversham.
L. Courtney of Penwith.
L. Allendale.

The Committee to meet on Thursday next, at half-past Three o'clock, and to appoint their own Chairman.

### QUALIFICATION OF WOMEN (COUNTY AND BOROUGH COUNCILS) BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the law relating to the capacity of women to be elected and act as members of county or borough councils—was presented by The Lord President (*E. Crewe*); read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Thursday, the 30th instant. (No. 56.)

House adjourned at a quarter past Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Tuesday*, 14*th May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three o'Clock.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Great Central Railway Bill.—As amended, considered, a Clause added, Amendments made, Bill to be read the third time.

Tyne Improvement Bill [Lords] (by Order).—Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed.

### OREGON MORTGAGE COMPANY LIMITED, ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

" To confirm a Provisional Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, relating to the Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited," presented by Mr. Sinclair, and ordered, under Section 7 of the Act, to be considered upon Thursday.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 11) BILL.

" To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Evesham, Melton Mowbray, the Dewsbury Joint Hospital District, and the Mid Sussex Joint Water District," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 195.]

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

" To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the borough of East Ham and urban districts of Barking Town and Ilford, and the borough of Sunderland," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 196.]

Newquay and District Water Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

London United Tramways Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Baines' Name Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords].—Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords].—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

---

### MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act to extend the Destructive Insects Act, 1877, to all pests destructive to crops, trees, or bushes." [Destructive Insects and Pests Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to authorise the Urban District Council of St. Neot's to acquire the undertaking of the St. Neot's Water Company, and to supply water throughout their district and the neighbourhood thereof; and for other purposes." [St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to provide for the granting of superannuation allowances to the officers and servants of the Council of the royal borough of Kensington; and for other purposes." [Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, " An Act to authorise the Corporation of Tynemouth to construct additional works; to borrow additional moneys; and for other purposes." [Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [Lords.]

St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

## *PETITIONS.*

### COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition from Aspatria, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS )BILL.

Petition from Fulham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Aberdour; Dumfries; and Wick and Pulteneytown; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Blackwell, against; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Fulham, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Falkirk, against; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: from Assynt; Candleriggs; and, Kirkintilloch; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against; from Barry; and, Bishop's Fonthill; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petitions for legislation: From Farnham; Faversham; Lewisham; Longtown; and, Romford; to lie upon the Table.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### CLYDE PORTS (VESSELS ENTERING, ETC.).

Return [Presented 10th May] to be printed. [No. 154.]

### RAILWAY RETURNS (PRELIMINARY STATEMENT).

Copy presented, of Return relating to the Railways of the United Kingdom for the year 1906 (Preliminary Statement) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Robertsbridge and Pevensey Light Railway Orders of 1900 and 1903 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Mansfield and in the urban districts of Mansfield Woodhouse and of Sutton-in-Ashfield and in the rural district of Skegby, in the county of Nottingham, in extension of the Light Railways authorised by the Mansfield and District Light Railways Order, 1901, and for other purposes [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Leicester and District Light Railways Order, 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Brackenhill Light Railway Orders of 1901 and of 1904 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the West Riding of the county of York, from Ackworth to Kirk Smeaton [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the urban district of Llanelly and in the rural district of Llanelly, in the county of Carmarthen [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Dudley and District Light Railways Order, 1898, and the Dudley and District Light Railways (Extensions) Order, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the West Riding of the county of York, from Sharow to Kirkby Malzeard [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3782 and 3783 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### MINES AND QUARRIES (EXPLOSION AT URPETH COLLIERY).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by J. B. Atkinson, Esquire, M.Sc. one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, on the circumstances attending an Explosion which occurred at Urpeth Colliery, near Birtley, Durham, on 17th December, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### POLLING DISTRICTS (WEST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire altering certain Polling Districts in the Sowerby, Barnsley, Doncaster, and Holmfirth Parliamentary Divisions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return ordered: "showing: (1) the Rates of Duties, Taxes, or Imports collected by Imperial officers; (2) the quantities or amounts taxed; (3) the gross receipts derived from each Duty; and (4) the net receipts and appropriations thereof in the year ending the 31st day of March, 1907; and (1) the aggregate gross receipts derived from all such Duties, Taxes, or Imposts under the principal heads of revenue; (2) the aggregate net receipts; (3) the charges of collection; and (4) the produce, after deducting these charges, in each of the ten years ending the 31st day of March, 1907; and notes to show any changes in the Taxes, Duties, and Imposts consequent upon the acceptance of the Budget proposals of 1907 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 253, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Goddard.*)

### CROFTERS HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.

Copy ordered "of the Crofters Holdings (Scotland) Acts, indicating the extensions and Amendments thereof proposed by the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill."—(*Mr. Sinclair*).

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

### Dumbarton Sewage Purification.

MR. ROBERT DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state how many Scottish burghs, including police burghs have adopted, or have under consideration, modern systems of sewage purification works; and whether there are any special circumstances in the case of the burgh of Dumbarton why similar works should not be constructed by it.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Local Government Board inform me that in February last it was found that eighteen Scottish burghs had biological systems of sewage purification already in operation. In seven cases systems were being laid down, and in the case of fourteen burghs schemes were under consideration. What system would best suit the burgh of Dumbarton could only be decided on after obtaining expert advice.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Thomas Walsh.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when the evicted farm of Thomas Walsh, on the Ormathwaite Estate, at Coolodorig, Listowel, was inspected; when the offer, if any, has been made to the landlord by the Estates Commissioners; and what reply, if any, has the landlord given in connection with the reinstatement of Thomas Walsh.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners first communicated their estimated price for the holding to the owner's agent on 18th September, 1906. No reply having been received the Commissioners sent reminders to the agent, who, on 20th April, informed them that he had forwarded their estimate to the owner, but had not yet received a reply.

### Land Purchase Finance—Opportunity for Discussion.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Prime Minister if he can now say approximately when the promised opportunity will be afforded for discussing land purchase finance; and will the question be raised in such a way that discussion of the method of inflating price and bonus will be in order.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The Government will try and give an early Friday after private Members' rights over Fridays have been satisfied.

### Letting of Crown Property—Employment of Local Agents.

SIR GEORGE KEKEWICH (Exeter): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the letting of local properties belonging to the Crown is left entirely in the hands of the Crown Agents, Messrs. Clutton; and whether he will consider the advisability, with a view to securing the more speedy letting of such properties and avoiding loss of revenue, of placing them in the hands of local agents instead of merely placing notice boards on the properties.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) My hon. friend is mistaken in thinking that Messrs. Clutton are the only agents for Crown property. Except in London it is part of the duties of the Crown receivers (including Messrs. Clutton) to arrange relettings when necessary of the premises for which they are receivers, subject to instructions from the Commissioner of Woods in charge of the premises. To employ other agents would lead to additional expense which as a general rule is not considered necessary. In exceptional cases agents are employed and Crown premises to let are advertised in local or other suitable papers as appears expedient.

### Sale of Spirit Licences in Amritsar.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for India, whether he is aware that by notification, dated the 4th September, 1906, the number of licences for the sale of country and English spirits in Amritsar to be auctioned for 1907–8 was fixed at six, and that fourteen licences have again been sanctioned; whether he is aware that this is a contravention of the Excise Commissioner's Circular Letter, No. 608, of May 19th, 1906; and whether, having regard to the public protests which the confirmation of these licences has evoked, inquiries will be made with a view to the reduction originally contemplated being carried out.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have no information regarding the circumstances to which my attention is called, but I will request the Government of India to make inquiries into the matter and to instruct the local government to take any acton that may be necessary to bring the licensing arrangements at Amritsar into conformity with the circular of the Excise Commissioner.

### Irish Savings Bank Business.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state the total amount of Irish Savings Bank withdrawals for the last annual period for which the figures are available; the total amount of Irish withdrawals of one pound and under for the same period; and the number of complaints received from depositors in Ireland during the same period in respect to the inconvenience caused to them by having to send their deposit books to London for examination on every occasion when they withdrew amounts of one pound or under.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The total amount of the Post Office Savings Bank withdrawals in Ireland during the year ended December 31st, 1906 (the last annual period for which the figures are available), was £2,209,846. Of this amount it is estimated that about £144,000 was withdrawn "on demand" in sums of £1 and under. No complaints appear to have been received from depositors in Ireland of inconvenience occasioned to them by the rule which requires that the deposit book shall be sent to London on each occasion of a withdrawal "on demand."

### Irish Postal Business.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that 99 per cent. of the manufactured stuff used in the Post Office in Ireland is not manufatured in Ireland, and that clerical work can be as efficiently and, having regard to the cost of housing accommodation, more economically performed in Dublin than in London, will he explain why all the paid Irish postal orders are sent to London for checking purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am having inquiry made in order to ascertain whether any part of the work of examining postal orders paid in Ireland could, with advantage, be performed in Dublin.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will state the annual income and the annual expenditure relating to the Post Office in Ireland for the past twenty years, and the approximate amount of this expenditure spent during each of those years on material imported into Ireland; whether the loss shown on the Irish Post Office is only a paper loss; and whether he will state the approximate annual profit on the Irish Post Office for the past twenty years when debited and credited with actual figures.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The annual income and expenditure relating to the Post Office in Ireland for the seventeen years from 1890 to 1906 were as follows:—

| Year ended 31st March. | Annual Income. | Annual Expenditure. |
|---|---|---|
| | £ | £ |
| 1890 - - | 678,710 | 664,099 |
| 1891 - - | 701,049 | 688,978 |
| 1892 - - | 724,812 | 749,046 |
| 1893 - - | 734,889 | 772,300 |
| 1894 - - | 752,293 | 792,810 |
| 1895 - - | 763,647 | 801,561 |
| 1896 - - | 795,168 | 807,720 |
| 1897 - - | 809,000 | 823,000 |
| 1898 - - | 824,000 | 866,000 |
| 1899 - - | 846,000 | 943,000 |
| 1900 - - | 878,000 | 1,025,000 |
| 1901 - - | 903,000 | 1,061,000 |
| 1902 - - | 923,000 | 1,087,000 |
| 1903 - - | 960,000 | 1,140,000 |
| 1904 - - | 980,000 | 1,126,000 |
| 1905 - - | 1,002,000 | 1,172,000 |
| 1906 - - | 1,043,000 | 1,199,000 |

The above figures have been taken from the Financial Relations Returns, which were first compiled in 1890. The approximate expenditure in those years on material imported into Ireland for Post Office purposes cannot be stated. The annual loss shown on the Irish Post Office in the last fifteen years is not merely a paper loss, but the best available estimate of the financial results of the working of the Irish Post Office in those years.

### Suggested Transfer of Irish Postal Savings Bank Business to Dublin.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Postmaster-General whether the late Government had decided to transfer the Irish portion of the Post Office Savings Bank from London to Dublin shortly before the Dunraven devolution scheme was discussed in the public Press; if so, will he say why the late Government abandoned the carrying out of such transfer; and how many Savings Bank clerks were asked at that time whether they would serve in Dublin in case of a change.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There was not, so far as I am aware, any decision such as that mentioned by the hon. Member.

### Loss of Registered Letters Addressed to Spain.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): To ask the Postmaster-General whether his attention has been called to the number of thefts of letters registered and otherwise despatched from this country to Spain; whether he has communicated these complaints to the Spanish postal authorities; and, if so, with what result; and whether he has paid compensation for registered letters despatched to Spain and which were not delivered; and, if not, will he do so.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) All complaints of the loss of registered or other letters despatched hence to Spain are duly communicated to the Spanish Post Office; and every endeavour is made to clear them up. In five cases during the last twelve months registered packets sent to Spain were proved not to have been delivered. Three of these were sample packets, and were seized by the Spanish Customs authorities because the addressees refused to pay the duty levied on them. The Spanish Post Office authorised payment of compensation, *i.e.*, the prescribed postal union indemnity of 50 francs, to the senders in the other two cases.

### Overtime of Dublin Telegraphists.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that certain Dublin telegraphists who performed overtime on 9th April, had their regular attendances subsequently curtailed and overtime cancelled; whether he can state the reason of this departure from practice, and whether this course has his sanction; and whether the officials subjected to this treatment, who made representations locally, will be favoured with a reply to their representations.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The matter to which the hon. Member refers was reported to me, and I have already given instructions for the full overtime payment to be allowed.

### Metropolitan Railway Whistles.

MR. STANGER (Kensington, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that annoyance has for a long time past been caused to residents in North Kensington, in the neighbourhood of the Metropolitan Railway, owing to the drivers of locomotives sounding their whistles or sirens upon approaching the stations, and that this practice has continued in spite of constant protests, and notwithstanding assurances by the general manager of the company that such whistling is contrary to orders; and whether he will consider the advisability of taking action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have communicated with the railway company in this matter, and have received a reply of which I am sending my honourable friend a copy.

### Local Government Electors in Ireland.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the population and number of local government electors in each of the Parliamentary constituencies in Ireland according to the latest Returns.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Parliamentary Return, No. 22, of this session shows the population and the number of Parliamentary electors in each Parliamentary constituency. Particulars as to the number of local government electors in each Parliamentary constituency in Ireland have not been prepared, but if the hon. Member should see fit to move for a Return giving those particulars, I will offer no objection to its being granted. Its preparation would, however, take some time, as the information would have to be obtained from the clerks of the peace, who have the custody of the registers. The population of each constituency could also be shown in the Return.

### Restriction of Ocean Fishing Rights off County Donegal.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution, unanimously passed by the County of Donegal Committee of Agriculture, in condemnation of the by-law proposed by the Agricultural Department restricting the fishermen's rights of public fishing in the ocean off the congested districts of the county Donegal, in the sole interests of the Foyle and Bann Fishery Company which has the monopoly of the entire of Lough Foyle and its rivers and tributaries; and, if so, what reply has been given to that resolution; and what steps have the Government taken or do they propose to take in prevention of this incursion of public rights.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*): The proposed by-law was submitted for the approval of the Lords Justices in Council, but they declined to approve of it. The by-law has therefore not come into force.

### Irish Stone for Irish Government Buildings.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a resolution of the Donegal County Council, unanimously adopted by the County Donegal Committee of Agriculture, protesting against proposals for the building of the superstructure of the technical training college with Portland stone, notwithstanding that a much superior stone, Mount Charles stone, can be had in the county Donegal, and has been used with great success in large buildings, among others in the cathedral in Letterkenny, its superiority having been conclusively proved by analysis; and whether, by representation to the Treasury or by any other method, steps will be taken that Irish stone, when admittedly superior in quality, will be used in Irish Government buildings in preference to foreign material.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am informed that large quantities of brick and stone of Irish origin will be used in the superstructure of the building and that Portland stone will only be employed when no other is so suitable.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Francis Gallagher.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Francis Gallagher, an evicted tenant living at Irvinestown, county Fermanagh; and, if so, whether any steps are being taken to reinstate him or provide him with a farm.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into the case of Francis Gallagher, and upon full consideration of the facts have decided to take no action in the case.

### Whereabouts of Burrowes, of Burrowes and Mayne.

MR. COGAN (Wicklow, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the police are aware of the whereabouts of Burrowes, of the firm of Burrowes and Mayne, stockbrokers, who defrauded his clients; and, if so, why they do not bring him to justice.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It does not seem desirable to answer such a Question as this, as doing so might in many cases defeat the course of justice. The hon. Member may rest assured that the police will spare no effort to bring offenders to justice.

### The Irish Privy Council.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to furnish a list of the present members of the Irish Privy Council, showing the county or city in Ireland in which each is a ratepayer.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I refer to my Answer to the Question put by the hon. Member for South Down on the 10th instant.† I have no information as to the districts in which members of the Privy Council may be ratepayers.

### The Dunraven Devolution Scheme.

Mr. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can see his way to circulating, for the information of Members of this House, a copy of the scheme of Devolution drafted in 1903–4 by Lord Dunraven and the Under-Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I find that no such document exists among the records of the Irish Government.

### The Irish Council—Revenue of the Eight Departments to be Absorbed.

Mr. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the gross revenue from all sources of each of the eight departments to be placed under the control of the Irish Council, and the total; the gross revenue from all sources of each of the Irish departments not to be placed under that control, and the total; and add to this latter total the gross annual payments and expenditure for and in connection with land by the Congested Districts Board, the Land Commission, and Estates Commissioners, respectively, the total sum paid as bonus under the Land Act of 1903 to the 31st March, 1907, and the total net loss incurred under all heads under that Act to 31st March, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It would not be desirable to attempt to deal with a complicated matter of this kind by way of Question and Answer. If the hon. Member should think fit to move for a Return, and would acquaint me in the first place with the terms of his proposed Motion, the question of granting the Return would be fully considered.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Bryan Galvin.

Mr. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the Estates Commissioners hope to be able to reinstate Bryan Galvin, of Inch East, near Listowel, an evicted tenant, in his holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have investigated the case of Bryan Galvin, and, upon full consideration of all the facts, have decided to take no action in the case.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Michael Mulvihill.

Mr. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for a grant from Michael Mulvihill, of Shronowen, Listowel, who claims he was evicted in 1889, and 1900, and again in 1901; and whether his application can be acceded to.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The application referred to was only recently received by the Estates Commissioners. The case will be investigated in due course.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Mrs. Connor.

Mr. FLAVIN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether John Sands, the landlord of the evicted farm at Cloontubbrid, Listowel, has offered same to the Estates Commissioners, so as to reinstate the evicted tenant, Mrs. O'Connor; and, if so, how soon the evicted tenant may hope to get back.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are about to have an inspection made, with the owner's permission, of the lands of the Cloontubbrid South, with the object of estimating the price which they may offer for the property. The question whether the evicted tenant can be reinstated cannot be considered at the present stage.

### Free Grants to Congested Districts Boards for Construction of Piers, Harbours, etc.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the total amount of the free grants of money that have been made to Ireland under the heads of Congested Districts Boards, Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, piers, harbours and navigation since 1840, and other free grants, respectively.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 468.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The preparation of a statement of expenditure from State sources upon piers, harbours, and navigation works for the past sixty-seven years would involve the utmost labour, and I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by preparing such a statement unless corresponding statements were prepared for England and Scotland in order to permit of comparison. The sums spent by the Congested Districts Board and the Department of Agriculture can be ascertained from the Annual Reports of these bodies.

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Greenwich Observatory and the County Council Generating Station.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a formal reply on the subject of the generating station at Greenwich has yet been received from the London County Council in compliance with the request made to them last March.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, (Dundee): Yes, Sir. I may add that the Admiralty stands by the report of the special Committee, and have communicated that fact to the London County Council.

MR. ASHLEY: Have the County Council agreed to carry out the recommendations of the Committee?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have reported the latest phase of the proceedings.

### Sales of Obsolete War Vessels.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can give the estimated market value of the three obsolete war vessels sold from the Holy Loch, had these been sold without the breaking-up condition; and, if not, will he take steps to find this out regarding the remaining vessels anchored in the Clyde.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It is not possible in either case to say what price the vessels in question would realise if sold without any condition as to breaking up. We have no data on which to base an estimate.

### Dockyard Writers.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the attention of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty has been called to the disappointment which their new scheme with reference to the dockyard writers has aroused among the members of that class; whether their Lordships will receive a representative deputation from all the Royal Dockyards in order that the writers' views may be expressed; and whether, until that is done, their Lordships will give directions that the new scheme should not be put into force.

MR. MALLET (Plymouth): At the same time may I ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that first-class dockyard writers have had no improvement in their maximum scale of pay since 1879; whether, under the new scheme just issued by the Admiralty, these writers will be unable to get an advance of pay unless they give up their established positions and their right to a pension; and, if so, whether, before that scheme is acted on, the Lords of the Admiralty will consent to receive a deputation from the writers to show why, on this and on other points, the new scheme has caused dissatisfaction to the men.

MR. E. ROBERTSON: Though the maximum pay of these writers has not been changed there have been improvements in their pay and possibilities of promotion during the period mentioned. First class established writers who receive the maximum rate of pay of 8s. a day have been given the option of entering the new (hired) grade carrying an increased maximum of 8s. 6d. a day. The acceptance of this offer will not involve the forfeiture of pension in respect to their service prior to date of transfer to new grade. No reason is seen for suspending the order issued recently that the new scheme was to come into operation on the 1st ultimo. The writers were heard at the dockyard inquiries last year, and the same class have brought their complaints before the Board at the visit to Chatham this year, and will be allowed to do the same thing when the Board's visits take place to the remaining dockyards this summer.

### Royal Scots Greys.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, if he persists in sending the Royal Scots Greys to Bulford, there will be thirty-eight families who will be compelled to live at Tidworth, a distance of eight miles, and thirty-eight married men, not on the establishment, who will be separated from their wives and children completely for a period of probably eighteen months or two years; and, if so, whether, in view of the cruelty and hardship involved, he will consider the advisability of utilising the empty infantry barracks at Tidworth, so as to make proper provision for all the married men, it being only necessary to put up wooden stabling for the horses; and whether he could see his way, even now, to make this most necessary and desirable change in the arrangements.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): Arrangements are in course of being made for moving the regiment to Tidworth instead of to Bulford.

### Volunteer Field Artillery.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that by the Bill now before the House it is proposed to create Volunteer Field Artillery, he will adhere to his expressed intention of destroying some 3,800 of the Royal Artillery, and by so doing reduce the Artillery Reserve.

MR. HALDANE: I have nothing to add at present to the very full statements which I have already made on these points.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): What will be the name of the Field Artillery in the Territorial Force?

MR. HALDANE: I cannot say at present.

### Unrest in India.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, having regard to the fact that the political agitation in India has for its purpose the desire of the educated Indians, Mahomedans, and Hindus to participate in the government of their own country, he will give instructions that Mr. Lajpatrai, the pleader of the Punjab chief court, who has been recently deported, shall be given a public trial.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): I made a very full statement on this subject yesterday, and I have nothing to add to, or take from, it.

### The Zambesi Falls.

MR. ESSEX (Gloucestershire, Cirencester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can now inform this House of the terms and conditions of concessions and reservations made at the Victoria Falls (Zambesi) by the British South Africa Company.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The British South Africa Company have, by indenture dated the 14th December, 1906, in pursuance of an agreement of even date, granted and devised to the African Concessions Syndicate, Limited, the exclusive lease of the entire water power of the river Zambesi at the place known as the Victoria Falls, for a period of seventy-five years from the 31st December, 1906, with power to enter upon and use an area of land which is described as having a five-mile radius from Livingstone Islands — always excepting the Rain Forest and the public parks on both banks of the river. No works, however, are to be constructed in this area other than a weir and a canal. The agreement fully defines the purpose of the lease to the syndicate, and attaches certain conditions to the use of the Zambesi for the purpose of developing and transmitting electrical power. One of these conditions is that the syndicate shall undertake that none of the works to be carried out under the agreement shall destroy, disfigure, or interfere with the natural beauty and characteristics of the Victoria Falls and their surroundings. The other provisions of the agreements are too long to be compressed within the limits of an Answer in this House.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Does the agreement reserve any revisionary powers to the British South African administration, safeguarding the public interest and preventing the creation of a monopoly?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I must ask for notice of that Question.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): In view of the danger to the picturesqueness of the falls, will care be taken that too much water is not taken from the Zambesi from above the falls during the dry season?

Mr. CHURCHILL was understood to say that that was provided against.

### The New Hebrides.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the case of children or young females being recruited as indentured labourers under the New Hebrides Convention, they shall only be so recruited when accompanied by their parents, from whom they shall not be separated.

I beg also to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the case of married women being recruited under the New Hebrides Convention as indentured labourers, they shall only be so recruited when accompanied by their husbands, from whom they shall not be separated.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Owing to the fact that natives of the New Hebrides have three or four wives, who are exchanged whenever it pleases the men to do so, there are difficulties in the way of adopting the hon. and gallant Member's suggestions as they stand. No doubt these difficulties were felt by the Conservative Government which in 1888 passed the Ordinance under which females between the ages of twelve and forty may be recruited from the New Hebrides for service in Fiji without any restriction but their own consent. His Majesty's Government are, however, considering whether any licences issued to British vessels should not altogether forbid the recruiting of females for service outside the group. I have already explained that the limit of height under Article XXXIII (2) of the recent Convention will be so fixed as to exclude the employment of children of tender years.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Will the restriction of which the right hon. Gentleman speaks affect also the importation or exportation of children to New Caledonia?

Mr. CHURCHILL: If the hon. Gentleman had followed my Answer he would have heard that the Government are considering whether any licences issued to British vessels shall not altogether forbid the recruiting of females for service outside the group.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Will that restriction involve an alteration of the text of the Convention?

Mr. CHURCHILL: No, Sir. The licences which have to be issued under the Convention can be withheld at the discretion of the officer in charge.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): Will French vessels be allowed to carry them?

Mr. CHURCHILL said the British Government only dealt with the affairs of the British Empire, affairs which concerned British people and people who came under its authority.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: Are we to understand that the Government has not a joint responsibility with the French Government for the exportation of labour in any portion of the South Seas?

Mr. CHURCHILL: No, Sir; but notice should be given of questions in regard to matters of legal difficulty, complicated by our relations to another Power.

### St. Helena.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any official information as regards the present condition of the island of St. Helena; whether any offer has been made by the Government to help the inhabitants to emigrate; and, if so, how many, if any, of them took advantage of the offer.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Secretary of State is kept fully informed by the Governor as to the condition of St. Helena. Inquiries were made recently as to how many persons would wish to emigrate if passages were provided; and eleven men and women offered themselves for domestic service in South Africa, and sixty-three men for employment as ordinary seamen; but it has not yet been possible to arrange a practical scheme of emigration.

### British Embassy at Tokio—Medical Officer.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the medical officer to the British Embassy at Tokio is a British subject; and whether he is a legally qualified medical practitioner within the meaning of the Medical Acts.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I understand that Dr. Wunsch, the medical officer referred to, who was appointed early in 1905 and still holds the post, is not a British subject. But before he was appointed endeavours were made by His Majesty's Ambassador at Tokio to secure the services of a suitable British subject, and none was available. As regards the second part of the Question, I must point out that Dr. Wunsch has very high qualifications, and as his practice is in Japan the special technical qualification referred to does not apply.

SIR W. J. COLLINS: Is not the British Embassy at Tokio a public institution within the meaning of the Act, and is it not therefore contrary to law to appoint anyone else than a registered medical practitioner?

SIR EDWARD GREY: If so, the Embassy would have had to go without a medical officer.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): Was the appointment advertised?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I cannot say.

### Sweden and Norway—Treaty Negotiations.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any progress has yet been made in the negotiations between this country and other Powers with a view to the substitution of a new treaty for that of 1855 with reference to Sweden and Norway.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The negotiations to which the hon. Member refers are still under consideration, and, for the reason given in my reply to a similar Question on 11th April,† I am unable to make any statement concerning them.

### Tonkin Railways.

SIR F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the arrangement with France in 1896, whereby it was agreed to share equally all privileges or advantages that might be conceded by China in Yunnan, included any arrangement for the passage of British goods for China through Tonkin without payment of duty, or for a drawback on the Chinese frontier of any duty which may have been levied at the port of entry; if not, whether, in view of the penetration of the Chinese provinces of Yunnan and Kwangsi by the Tonkin railways, His Majesty's Government will, in the interests of British trade, endeavour to make such arrangements; and whether any preferential treatment is accorded to French goods on the steamers on the Red River or on the railway in Tonkin.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative, but the matter will be considered in the event of an opportunity occurring. Nothing is known of any preferential treatment of French goods on the steamers on the Red River or on the railways in Tonkin.

### Egyptian Ministry of Justice.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the number of British judges and other British judicial officers attached to the Ministry of Justice in Egypt; and what is their rate of increase since the conclusion of the Anglo-French Agreement of 8th April, 1904.

---

† See (4) *Debates* clxxii., 361.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information which enables me to answer the hon. Member's Question exactly. But he can find particulars respecting the number and rate of increase of the European staff of the Egyptian Ministry of Justice in Lord Cromer's last Report (see Egypt Blue-book No. 1, 1907, page 38). I will make inquiry as to the further information asked for.

### British Consuls in Egypt.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any, and which, of the British Consuls in Egypt have been appointed to such posts by reason of their commercial and industrial experience; and whether, if such be not the case, he will, in order to assist British subjects in meeting the severe and increasing competition in that country, replace the present Consuls by others possessing the requisite experience, or, alternatively, will appoint commercial and industrial experts to British consulates in Egypt.

SIR EDWARD GREY: There are two British Consuls, one with the local the other with the personal rank of Consul-General, in Egypt, apart from Sir Eldon Gorst. Both of these Consuls are officers of long and thorough experience in all the duties, including the commercial duties, discharged by their service in oriental countries; and no reflection has been cast upon their qualifications for their present posts, which they have held for some years. There is, therefore, no reason for making any change at present of consular officers in Egypt. There are, in addition, two Vice-Consuls in Egypt. Consular posts in Egypt are usually filled from the Levant Service, entrance to which is obtained by open competition. With regard to the suggestion of the hon. Member that commercial and industrial experts should be chosen outside the service, I must point out that there is no more reason for doing this as regards Egypt than there is in the case of other industrial countries. The best we can do is to get men who have some commercial knowledge to enter for the Consular Service, to give them some training at the Board of Trade before beginning their duties abroad, and to encourage the study of commercial matters afterwards.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): Have any of these Consuls employed in Egypt received any commerial training? Has not Germany several Consuls in Egypt having business qualifications?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware of the particular qualifications of the German Consuls, but with regard to the whole Consular Service our effort is to encourage commercial training.

### Cairo Post Office.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, why, seeing that Friday is the Moslem day of rest, there is not the same restriction of hours on that day as on Sundays in the postal service at Cairo and Alexandria; and whether the Customs offices are closed on Sundays and open on Fridays.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I do not know what the facts are, and I am not aware that any complaint has been made on the points referred to in the Question. But it is clearly a matter which must be left to the discretion of the Egyptian Government.

### Alien Criminals.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the number of persons received into London prisons on conviction, summary or other, during 1906, who according to their own statements were born in foreign countries.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The figure is 1,823, which compares very satisfactorily with the figure 2,206 for the previous year, 1905.

### Hours of Work in Mines Inquiry.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will expedite the issue of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Hours of Work in Mines immediately the Report is made; and if he can now say when it is likely to be in the hands of Members.

MR. GLADSTONE: The Committee expect to place their Report in my hands this week, and steps will be taken to expedite the printing as much as possible so that it may be available for Members shortly after Whitsuntide.

### South Metropolitan Gas Company and the London Municipal Society.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that the South Metropolitan Gas Company made a contribution to the funds of the London Municipal Society previous to the late London County Council election; and, if so, is he in a position to state the amount of such contribution.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): I am informed by the South Metropolitan Gas Company that they subscribed a sum of £21 to the funds of the London Municipal Society in January last. I am causing the directors' letter, which is rather too long to read to the House, to be printed with the Votes.

[The letter was as follows]:—

"South Metropolitan Gas Company.
"709, Old Kent Road, S.E.
"8th May, 1907.

"The Assistant Secretary
"(Harbour Department),
"Board of Trade,
"7, Whitehall Gardens, S.W.

"Sir,

"In reply to the question anent a subscription to the London Municipal Society in your letter of the 1st instant, which was read to my Board to-day, being their first meeting after its receipt, I have to say that this company subscribed £21 to that society in January last.

"In response to your further inquiry for any observations the directors may have to make on the subject, I am instructed to say that this company is one of the largest ratepayers in South London, paying £88,000 a year in rates, being an increase of 50 per cent. in the last seven years.

"Under the operation of the sliding scale as applied to gas companies whereby gas shareholders and gas consumers are made partners, gains or losses are divided in the proportion of about 6½ to the consumers to 1 to the shareholders. Consequently of this large sum about 86 per cent., or £75,000, a year is paid by the consumers, the predominant partner.

"Parliament having by the sliding scale united the interests of consumers and shareholders, it is the duty of the company as well as its interest to do the best for both parties by economising in every possible way.

"It is to the advantage of the consumers, who are all ratepayers, as well as that of the company's shareholders and its employees, who are also shareholders, that the waste and extravagance of the local authorities should be checked, and that honest and capable men should be elected on public bodies to secure economical and efficient management, for efficiency cannot be separated from economy. The directors consider it their duty to adopt all lawful means to that end, and they believe the action they have taken is for the public good.

"I am also instructed to direct attention to the gross injustice which the continuance of the present system inflicts on all joint stock companies; they pay a very large and increasing proportion of the rates with no control whatever over their expenditure, and with no voice or vote in the election of the London and borough councillors or the members of the boards of guardians. Such taxation without representation cannot be justified. The system, or rather the want of system, has been allowed to grow with the growth of joint stock companies, and a remedy is urgently needed to give them their proper share in municipal government.

"I am, etc.,
"(signed) FRANK BUSH,
"Secretary."

### Registrar of Births and Deaths.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that a number of registrars of births and deaths in certain districts suffer serious reductions of income by reason of depopulation, and consequently on retirement receive superannuation allowance sums disproportionate to their contributions in the early years of their appointment; and whether he will consider the advisability of appointments to registrarships at a fixed salary instead of the present system of payment by fees, and the need of an inquiry into the practicability of a proper system of promotion.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I am aware that in a certain number of cases the amount of the fees received by registrars of births and deaths is reduced by reason of a diminution in the population of the areas for which they act and other causes, whilst in a certain number of other cases the amount is increased by reason of a rise in the population of these areas and other causes. The registrars, however, accept the possibility of any such increase or diminution with their appointment, and where they lose fees in consequence of a re-arrangement of registration subdistricts they, as a rule, receive compensation. A fixed salary could not be substituted for the present system of payment by fees without legislation. I am not aware of any sufficient reason for an inquiry of the kind suggested.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN: Is it not a fact that they are paid by salary in Scotland?

### West Riding Higher Education Rate.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has yet decided, concerning the appeal of the West Riding County Council, to substitute a 3d. for the 2d. limit upon the rate for higher education imposed by the Education Act, 1902; and whether his decision is favourable to the substitution.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have received the report of the inspector after the inquiry recently held by him on this subject, and I am in communication with the Board of Education with regard to it.

### Hong Kong Mail Service.

MR. HOLT (Northumberland, Hexham): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the unsatisfactory character of the French mail service between this country and Hong Kong; and, having regard to the fact that letters for Hong Kong despatched from London to Singapore *via* Bombay, and posted again in Singapore, reach Hong Kong from three to five days earlier than they would do if posted in London on the same day direct to Hong Kong, he will take steps to forward mails to and from Hong Hong by this route, so as in conjunction with the fortnightly Peninsular and Oriental mail to give an efficient weekly mail service between this country and Hong Kong.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): My attention has not been called to anything unsatisfactory in the character of the mail service to Hong Kong by French packet; and there have not been any special complaints on the subject recently. It may be the case that letters for Hong Kong sent to Singapore by British contract packet *via* Bombay and reposted at Singapore occasionally reach Hong Kong earlier than the mails despatched by French contract packet the same week. This, however, can only occur when the Singapore Post Office happens to be in a position to send a mail to Hong Kong by a steamer leaving Singapore almost immediately after the arrival of the mails from England *via* Bombay; but the first regular contract packet from Singapore for Hong Kong is the French one. There would, therefore, be no advantage in sending mails to Singapore to wait there two or three days for the French packet by which they might have been sent from Europe. The British packet frequently arrives at Hong Kong ahead of the scheduled time while the French one is occasionally a little late, with the result that the French packet usually arrives ten days after the British one of the preceding week; but it must be borne in mind that correspondence for transmission by French packets can be posted in London at the General Post Office up to 9.30 on Saturday morning, while correspondence for the British packet leaves on Friday evening.

### Punishment in the Post Office.

MR. O'GRADY: I beg to ask the Postmaster General whether, when a Post Office servant is punished by loss of seniority, no amount of unblemished service will suffice to restore him to his former position; and, if so, whether he will modify the regulation which inflicts punishment for the whole of the man's service and denies him any power of recovery.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: In such a case the lost seniority is irrecoverable, except in so far as it might be regained by promotion to a superior class. To revise the rule would inflict injury on the reduced officer's colleagues whose conduct was better than his own and below whom he had been placed. Loss of seniority is a punishment imposed only in cases of grave misconduct; and I am not prepared to take any step which would weaken its effect.

### Education of Boarded-Out Pauper Children.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that hitherto children boarded-out in the country by Poor Law guardians have been admitted to free education in the local public elementary schools equally with the other village children, but that recently several provincial education authorities have claimed from the guardians the net cost of the education of boarded-out children, and intimated that in future children will not be admitted unless they are so paid for; and whether, with a view to preventing the discouragement of boarding-out in the country, he proposes to take any, and, if any, what steps in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I have no desire to discourage the system of boarding-out, and where the guardians' area is within the educational area in which children are boarded-out I agree with my hon. friend that there is no sufficient reason for the education authority to exact a contribution from the guardians. So far as I am aware no such claim is usually made. If any case of the kind is brought to my notice I shall be prepared to hold that the exclusion of such children on the ground that the guardians have refused to make a contribution is not reasonable. But where children are boarded-out in an area other than that in which they are normally resident it does not appear to me equitable that the ratepayers of that area should be under any obligation to bear the cost of educating such children if the guardians refuse to take advantage of the provisions which Parliament in Section 2 of the Elementary Education Act, 1900, has provided for the purpose.

### Halsall Charity.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, seeing that the trustees of the Halsall Charity applied for a new scheme more than two years ago, *i.e.*, in November, 1904, and that the Board of Education have continually been pressed by the ratepayers of Great Crosby to proceed with the scheme, he will state what are the reasons for the delay which has taken place in the preparation of the scheme; and whether the Board will now press forward the scheme for publication without further delay; and, if not, why further delay is judged necessary.

MR. MCKENNA: The preparation of the scheme was originally postponed in view of the fact that a sale of the charity property was in progress which was calculated materially to increase and has in fact materially increased the income available; and a further postponement was due to last year's Education Bill. A draft scheme is now in course of preparation and will be proceeded with as expeditiously as possible.

### Board of Education.

MR. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education of whom the Board consists; when and by whom they were appointed; the salaries and emoluments attached to the office of each member, apart from the President himself; whether he can state the date of its last meeting; when it is likely to be summoned to another meeting; and whether the Board, as a Board, have the appointment and dismissal of the staff and are responsible for its adequacy and efficiency.

MR. MCKENNA: The Board consists of a President, the Lord President of the Council (unless he is appointed President of the Board), His Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, the First Commissioner of His Majesty's Treasury, and the Chancellor of His Majesty's Exchequer. The Board was appointed in pursuance of Sub-section (2) of Section 1 of the Board of Education Act, 1899. Apart from the meagre allowance paid to the President no member of the Board receives any emolument by virtue of his membership. I have no record of any meeting of the Board, and I have no immediate intention of convening one. The Answer to the last paragraph is in the affirmative.

MR. CLOUGH: Is any ecclesiastical or sectarian test applied to members of this Board?

MR. MCKENNA: No, Sir.

### Defaulting Education Authorities.

MR. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education in how many instances the Education (Local Authority Default) Act, 1904, has been put into operation, and will he give a list thereof with the dates and causes of default, and of those which have since been withdrawn.

MR. MCKENNA: I will send my hon. friend a statement showing the payments under the Education (Local Authority Default) Act, 1904, with the dates on which they took place. The cause was in each case that specified in Sub-section (1) (b) of Section 1 of the Act, viz., that it appeared to the Board that the managers had for the purpose of maintaining and keeping efficient the school incurred expenses for which provision should have been made by the local education authority. I am not sure what meaning my hon. friend intends to attach to the last part of his Question. Transactions under the Default Act, as he is doubtless aware, consisted in reimbursing to the managers certain sums which were subsequently deducted by the Board from the grants payable to the local education authority. No question of withdrawing these transactions can, therefore, arise.

MR. CLOUGH: Have any withdrawn after being declared defaulters?

MR. MCKENNA: The moment they are declared to be in default the money is paid over to the managers so that there is no possibility of withdrawal.

### School Return for Wales.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he will give a Return showing, by counties, in Wales and Monmouthshire the numbers of provided and non-provided schools, respectively, which do and which do not receive assistance from the rates towards their maintenance.

MR. MCKENNA: As I stated on 15th and 18th April, I do not think it would be possible to compile a Return of this nature, and I am quite certain that the advantages to be derived from it would not be commensurate with the labour and expense which an attempt to obtain the information would involve.

### Boy Clerks in the Civil Service.

SIR GEORGE KEKEWICH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if the Treasury have yet considered the memorial of the boy clerks in the Civil Service and are now prepared to give a reply to the prayer of the memorial; and, if not, whether he can state approximately when an Answer is likely to be given.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): The subject is receiving careful consideration, and I hope that a decision may be arrived at before long.

### Customs Service.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury in what years since the issue of Treasury Minute, 24th March, 1891, departmental examinations for first-class examining officerships of Customs have been held; how many officers have been invited to attend; how many have presented themselves for examination; how many have passed on each occasion, and what modifications have been introduced from time to time in the various examinations; and under what conditions have the successful candidates qualified at each examination.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I have obtained these particulars and will show them to the Hon. Member.

### House-Letting in Scotland.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can inform the House as to the progress made by the Departmental Committee appointed to report upon the present system of house-letting in Scotland and proposals submitted for its reform.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that, at a meeting of the Scottish Trades Union Congress, held in Aberdeen last week, attended by 132 delegates from trades unions from all parts of Scotland, representing 122,000 tradesmen, the house-letting question was considered, and a resolution passed in favour of reform; and whether, in view of the importance of this question, he will say when the Report of the Departmental Committee, which some time ago concluded its inquiry on this subject, will be issued.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): I have nothing to add to the reply given to the hon. Member for the Camlachie Division of Glasgow on the 9th inst.†

### Inverness-shire Sanatorium.

MR. J. DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been drawn to the interdict recently granted against the parish council of Boleskine and Cleertarf from putting a road, which has always been regarded as a right of way, into a state of repair, which will permit it to be used as a means of access to a sanatorium being built by public subscription for the benefit of the people of Inverness-shire; and if he will take steps to enable this work to be completed.

MR. SINCLAIR: I have no official information, and am not in a position to express an opinion. The question appears to be one of disputed right of way, and while the general views of the Government on such questions are well known, I do not think that direct intervention is within my power.

### Grazing Farms in Ireland.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will advise the Estates Commissioners, or ensure in some other way, that the consideration of purchase by the State of grazing farms which have been surrendered and have come into the market in consequence of intimidation shall be deferred until such estates as are legitimately vacant shall have been disposed of under the Land Act of 1903.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): If the hon. Member's suggestion were acted upon the result would be that landlords who may have already suffered by having grazing farms left on their hands would still further suffer by being unable to sell such farms. I may however observe that on a previous occasion the Estates Commissioners have declared that if they should purchase untenanted lands in regard to which intimidation has taken place, they might be constrained to refuse to allot any portion of the land to persons who may have taken part in any such intimidation. I have repeatedly stated that all possible protection will be afforded to the occupiers of grazing farms in the exercise of their legal rights.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Is the intimidation so general as to make the danger a real one?

MR. BIRRELL: No, I do not think it is.

### Scotland and the Irish Council Grant.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what amount will fall to be paid by Scotland of the £600,000 which the Government proposes to devote to the new Irish Council.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): The additional amount proposed to be allocated to Ireland out of the proceeds of the taxation of the United Kingdom generally under the Irish Council Bill is £650,000. The contribution of the taxpayers of Scotland to this amount would, I take it, be in the same proportion as their contribution to English, Scottish, and Irish services generally, of which annual Returns are presented to the House.

### New South Wales and Unimproved Land Values.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the proposed legislation in New South Wales involving the paying for town improvements by a rate on the unimproved land value instead of on industry; and whether he will try to obtain and lay upon the Table of this House a Report from the Premier of New South Wales on the aims and scope of this proposed legislation, as well as on the Shires Act that was passed in 1905.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 369.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: So far as I am aware no new legislation is proposed. If my hon. friend desires it I will present to Parliament the Shires Act, 1905, and the Local Government Extension Act, 1906.

### Standing Committees.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) asked the Prime Minister if his attention had been drawn to the fact that Standing Committee "A" had had to be adjourned on the previous day to the great inconvenience of private Members, because no member of the Government or law officer of the Crown was present. He asked the right hon. Gentleman if he would take steps to secure that such a state of matters did not occur again.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was aware that the adjournment was only for half an hour, and that at the end of that time the Bill under discussion was gone through and reported to the House?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the Bill was a private Member's Bill, the adjournment was for seventeen and a half minutes, and the whole proceedings were thereafter finished in one and a quarter hours, when the Bill was reported to the House. He could not think, therefore, that any great inconvenience had been caused.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Did not the hon. Member for South Tyrone himself move the adjournment in order not to bring these Committees into disrepute?

---

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked as to the business to be taken immediately after the holidays.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN stated that on Thursday, 23rd May, it was proposed to take in Committee of Supply the following Votes—the Board of Agriculture, Prisons, Industrial Schools, and Poor Law Asylums. On Friday, the following day, it was the intention to take the Criminal Appeal Bill, but that question was deferred by request till the following Friday. He hoped the measure would be treated as non-Party, and that the progress made might be as rapid as possible, as the Bill had been postponed twice by request. It was proposed to take instead, on Friday, 24th May, first, the financial Resolution on the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill; and, secondly, the Second Reading of the following Bills in succession:—Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction) Bill, Vaccination Bill, Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill, Poisons and Pharmacy Bill, Employers' Liability (Insurance Companies) Bill, Public Health (Regulations as to Food) Bill, and Patents and Designs Consolidation Bill. This was, as might seem to some, a long story, but he hoped that many of its chapters would prove to be very short. On Monday, 27th May, the Government proposed to take the Report of the Financial Resolution on the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, and then the introduction of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill for England.

---

### STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had appointed Sir William Holland to act as Chairman of Standing Committee A, in the place of Sir Thomas Esmonde; and Sir David Brynmor Jones to act as Chairman of Standing Committee B, in the place of Mr. J. W. Wilson.

Report to lie upon the Table.

---

### SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Notification of Births Bill): Mr. Secretary Gladstone and Mr. Herbert Samuel; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Notification of Births Bill): Mr. Burns and Dr. Macnamara.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee A the following Fifteen Members (in respect of the Notification of Births Bill):—Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Lyttelton, Mr. Verney, Mr. Gulland, Mr. Masterman, Mr. Sherwell, Mr. Tennant, Dr. Cooper, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. Holt, Mr. Duncan Schwann, Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, Mr. James Gibb, Mr. Charles MacVeigh, and Mr. Percy Barlow.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill): Dr. Macnamara and Mr. Burns; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill): Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland and Sir Edward Strachey.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee B the following Fifteen Members (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill):—Viscount Morpeth, Mr. Hicks-Beach, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Hugh Barrie, Lord Willoughby d'Eresby, Mr. Lundon, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Halpin, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Nuttall, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Winfrey, Major M'Micking, Mr. Arthur Henderson, and Mr. A. H. Scott.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Burns and Dr. Macnamara; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill: Mr. Secretary Gladstone and Dr. Macnamara.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee B the following Fourteen Members (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Cave, Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Maclean, Mr. Lief Jones, Mr. Arthur Dewar, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Hall, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Thomas F. Smyth, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Charles Corbett, Mr. Clough, and Major Dunne.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

## *NEW BILLS.*

### DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACT (1896) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend The Diseases of Animals Act, 1896, with regard to the importation of Canadian live cattle," presented by Mr. Cairns; supported by Mr. Hamar Greenwood, Mr. Robert Price, Mr. Baker, Mr. Halley Stewart, Mr. Maddison, Sir Gilbert Parker, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Arthur Henderson, Sir Frederick Cawley, Mr. Cross, and Mr. Crooks; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 4th June, and to be printed. [Bill 197.]

### IMPORTED WATCH-CASES BILL.

"To exempt from assay foreign watch-cases imported into the United Kingdom before the first day of July, nineteen hundred and seven," presented by Mr. Kearley; to be read a second time upon Monday, 27th May, and to be printed. [Bill 198.]

### CONVEYANCING BILL.

"To amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881," presented by Mr. Micklem; supported by Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Radford, Mr. Berridge, Mr. Cave, Sir Francis Lowe, Mr. Astbury, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Bertram, and Mr. Napier; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th May, and to be printed. [Bill 199.]

### SETTLED LAND BILL.

"To amend the Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890," presented by Mr. Micklem; supported by Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Radford, Mr. Berridge, Mr. Cave, Sir Francis Lowe, Mr. Astbury, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Bertram, and Mr. Napier; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th May, and to be printed. [Bill 200.]

### MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY BILL.

"To amend The Married Women's Property Act, 1882," presented by Mr. Micklem; supported by Sir Henry Kimber, Mr. Radford, Mr. Berridge, Mr. Cave, Sir Francis Lowe, Mr. Astbury, Mr. Whitehead, Mr. Bertram, and Mr. Napier; to be read a second time upon

Tuesday, 28th May, and to be printed. [Bill 201.]

### EVIDENCE (COLONIAL STATUTES) BILL.

"To facilitate the admission in Evidence of Statutes passed by the Legislatures of British Possessions and Protectorates, including Cyprus," presented by Mr. Churchill; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed. [Bill 202.]

### BOARD OF EDUCATION SCHEME (HULME TRUST ESTATES EDUCATIONAL) CONFIRMATION BILL.

"To confirm a scheme approved and certified by the Board of Education under The Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853, relating to the Hulme Trust Estates (Educational)," presented by Mr. McKenna; supported by Mr. Lough, Mr. Bright, Sir Charles Schwann, Mr. Talbot, and Mr. Toulmin; to be read a second time upon Friday, 24th May, and to be printed. [Bill 203.]

---

### FINANCE BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [13th May] "That the Bill be now read a second time:"

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the financial needs of the country, as disclosed in the Budget statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, require that the basis of taxation should be broadened, in order that the anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the present condition of national and imperial trade,' "—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*,)—instead thereof.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.) said he was one of those who viewed with very great regret the introduction into the debate of the question of colonial preference, though he confessed his sorrow was considerably mitigated by the admirably wide terms in which the Amendment was conceived. Since the issue had unfortunately been raised, he craved the indulgence of the House to make one or two observations upon it, before proceeding to what he conceived to be the more important part of the discussion. He listened very carefully to the speeches from the Front Bench opposite the previous day, and he had been at the trouble of reading them over again that morning. He confessed they suggested to his mind a sense of vagueness and want of definiteness which was entirely the impression he received when he heard them. It seemed to him that the ghost of the old mercantile system was still stalking on the benches opposite. What was that system? It was founded upon the idea that the Colonies should remain, by nature appointed, producers of raw materials, and that the Home country should be the sole market for those raw materials, whilst, on the other hand, the Colonies were to be the monopolised market for the British producers. That, combined with the notion that it was the whole duty of the nation to export as much as possible of its production without any regard to the imports it received in exchange, might be said to be the beginning and the end of the old mercantile system. How much of it had been modernised and how much of it remained in the proposals put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham? He gladly admitted that some measure of enlightenment had come to those who were the inheritors of the old mercantile theory; as the right hon. Member for St. George's said the previous day, they at any rate fully recognised that any arrangement now made between ourselves and the Colonies must be on a voluntary basis. But still enlightenment vainly contended with mercantilism. They found them one moment appealing to the British people to make sacrifices to consolidate the Empire, and the next they found them holding out visions to the people of better employment and higher wages; one moment they were portraying Canada as Britain's Granary and the next they were presenting to the agricultural industry here a system that would protect them. The right hon. Member for St. George's the previous day, as he understood him, asked them what business man would give his rival an order even if he profited himself. They found right hon. Gentlemen opposite at one moment expressing lofty conception of Empire, and at the next going to the British manufacturer and asking him what sort of duty he would like to assist him in his business. Even were the most worthy part of the argument true, of whom was the sacrifice on behalf of the Empire demanded? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, whose absence they all deplored on this occasion, talked to the nation of sacrifice. What nation? Lord Beaconsfield said there were two nations—the nation of the rich, and the nation of the poor. Of which of these was the sacrifice demanded? It mattered little or nothing to him (Mr. Money) or to those above him in the social scale whether they taxed tea, sugar, corn, meat, cheese or butter; but it mattered a great deal, it mattered everything, to the other nation—to the great mass of the poor in our towns. It mattered a great deal to them whether or not they proceeded, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite put it, to broaden the basis of our taxation. It remained true, as the author of the modern form of this policy had said, that if they wanted to give a preference to the Colonies, they must put a tax on food. When right hon. Gentlemen opposite appealed to them in the cause of Imperial unity, he thought he might say, on behalf of himself and every hon. friend on that side of the House, and on the benches below the gangway on the other side of the House, that they were not deaf to that appeal. He was not, at any rate; but if he was to cherish this lofty conception of a united and consolidated Empire, which might be, as he thought, a tremendous idea for good in the world in the future, was he to put aside the even loftier idea, as he conceived it, of the re-union of the British-speaking peoples of the world? This policy of preference did nothing of a very material character for the Colonies; it established a tie which at the very best and highest could only be regarded, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham put it to the Colonial Conference of 1902, as a matter of sentiment—as a sentimental tie. Even regarded from that aspect, at its very highest, what was it in relation to the United States of America, the great race of English-speaking people? It had another aspect to them, and it seemed to him that it was a blow chiefly directed against the United States of America, who were one of our chief suppliers of food, raw material, and partly manufactured articles, which right hon. Gentlemen opposite desired to tax at an average of 10 per cent. It was against that nation, far more than Germany, that this policy was directed, and it was to be deprecated on that ground, because it was something to prevent the union of the British-speaking peoples of the world, which, in his opinion, was fraught with the most tremendous consequences for good, not only to ourselves but to the world at large. There was very much to be said for a policy of free trade within the Empire with or without an Imperial tariff against the nations outside the Empire; but what was it that stood between ourselves and free trade within the Empire? Let them take the case of the trade of 1906. We did about £260,000,000 worth of trade with British Possessions as a whole. Only £82,000,000 worth of that trade represented imports from the self-governing Colonies, and only as to a part of that £82,000,000 did the self-governing Colonies apply customs duties. Even in regard to those duties a certain portion of them were necessarily duties which new countries like our self-governing Colonies must need apply to imported goods in order to get a revenue at all. If that part were subtracted, it would be seen that only a small part of the trade within the Empire was not done on free trade conditions. As to that small part we were not to blame. It was the self-governing Colonies themselves that had erected any barrier that existed in the way of free trade within the Empire. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's had said that the President of the Board of Trade had elsewhere welcomed the forging of fetters between the several parts of the British Empire. Was that quite the proper way to represent what was said? They, as free traders, had not the slightest objection either to a self-governing Colony reducing these barriers, which were the only barriers which stood in the way of the realisation of the conception of free trade within the Empire, or of reducing the barriers which stood in the way of free trade with each other. The Cobden Club, which guarded the pure milk of the Cobdenite gospel, begged Sir

Wilfred Laurier, whose Government had given a preference to the United Kingdom, to accept their silver medal, and he believed he accepted it. That entirely represented the position of free traders with regard to any expansion of the preferential principle of the self-governing Colonies either toward each other or toward this country. They welcomed it as something towards free trade within the Empire. Unfortunately, it had been pointed out that the self-governing Colonies did not intend to lower their tariffs to the revenue point. Their doctrine was well expressed by the Resolution passed by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in 1902—

> "Whilst the Canadian tariff should be primarily framed for Canadian interests, it should give substantial preference to the Mother Country, recognising always that the minimum tariff must afford adequate protection to all Canadian producers."

That, of course, was a most important Resolution. He wished it had remained a pious Resolution; unfortunately, it was carried into very practical effect. Our chief competitor in the Colonies was not the foreign but the Colonial manufacturer; and it was equally true that the Colonial manufacturer's chief competitor was not the foreign but the British manufacturer. Of course, the anxiety of the Colonial manufacturers that a minimum tariff high enough to protect them should apply to British goods was the best possible compliment that could be paid to the exporting strength of the United Kingdom. The Canadian preferential tariff reached its highest point in 1900, when it was increased to 33⅓ per cent. reduction in all duties which were applied to imports, but unfortunately it had since been amended. Wherever it had since been shown, either by statistics or by the experience of Canadian manufacturers, that this gave any particular advantage to British manufacturers, the Canadian manufacturers were soon heard from by the Canadian Government. When Mr. Fielding, the Canadian Minister of Finance, rose in the Canadian House of Commons in June, 1904, to make his Budget statement, he found himself compelled to take serious notice of the complaints made by Canadian manufacturers. The chief complaints were made by the woollen manufacturers. They were saying in every place where they could raise their voices that they were being ruined by British competitors. Mr. Fielding began by reproaching them—

> "I am afraid they are not all equipped with the most modern machinery, and have not put themselves in a condition to fully enjoy the benefits the tariff holds out to them."

But he was sorry to say Mr. Fielding continued by giving way. He went on to say that the complaint was made very largely by their woollen manufacturers that, although in the better grade of goods they could fairly compete with all persons, a very large proportion of imports of British woollen goods were really shoddy goods of inferior character, against which they ought to legislate. Then he said that they did not propose to increase the general tariff, but to put a limit on the preference which should apply to these goods. It was hoped it would prove enough to keep out British goods, and, *ex hypothesi*, all other goods which were not so strongly competitive as British goods. That policy was not confined to woollen goods, but was applied to other goods in which it was alleged that British competition was severely felt. He thought therefore that he was entitled to say that the Canadian preferential tariff was whittled away in those respects in which it was shown it was any decisive advantage to the British manufacturer. It had never been with any enjoyment that he had looked the Canadian gift-horse in the mouth, nor had he analysed the preference with any desire to belittle it. His desire to do that only arose when the preference passed from the sphere in which it was admitted that no reciprocal obligation was imposed upon this country to another sphere in which we were told it was our duty to set up food taxes in order to pay for this Colonial preference. When that point arose, but not till then, they had a right to analyse the Colonial preference and cast doubts upon the advantages of it to the manufacturers in this country. If he might sum up their objections to the preference, he would say that it weakened the heart of the Empire, struck a blow at the trade of the United Kingdom, accentuated the local interests of the Colonies themselves, and produced feelings of division and feelings relating to sordid interests which would never arise if the policy of preference were not discussed.

Even in regard to Canada itself, it could not truly be said that the Colony collectively had ever had any advantage by the preference. Indeed, while on the one hand the policy was designed to benefit Canada as a British Colony, it actually caused discussion among the native manufacturers themselves. That was not a feeling the creation of which had done anything towards the consolidation of the British Empire. Colonial preference would strike not only at the United States, but at Argentina, where, he would remind the junior Member for the City of London, the railways and various undertakings were very largely owned by British capital. That was a consideration which appealed not so forcibly to him as it would to the junior Member for the City of London; but he was perfectly sure he could appeal to him to remember those widows and orphans dependent upon a small investment, say in Argentine railways, whom, only the other day, when discussing the question of old age pensions, the hon. Member used so touchingly and so effectively as an argument in connection with railway stock. There was another Imperial point which he thought ought to be seriously regarded by hon. Gentlemen opposite, and that was the question of India. He did not know whether hon. Gentlemen opposite had heard of the Swadeshi movement. He was informed that the meaning of the word "Swadeshi" was "own country," but he thought it might be translated as protection *in excelsis.* They refused to buy foreign goods at all. That serious movement surely demanded the attention of hon. Members. Was it wise on our part, the great and prosperous head of the British Empire to confess that we needed import duties, and at the same time to deny these import duties to India? The Indian imports of manufactures were derived almost entirely from this country. He forgot the proportion, but he thought it was something like eighty or ninety per cent. The Indian protectionist rightly regarded this country as his strongest competitor, and, if we taught these British subjects of ours that we ourselves regarded protection as necessary for the welfare of this country, how could we deny that same remedy to Indian manufactures? He did not know whether any answer would be afforded by hon. Gentlemen opposite. John Stuart Mill, and many other quite academic free traders, had held that if protection was anywhere excusable, it was in connection with new countries, or countries new in the sense that India was new to modern industry. He now passed to the question of revenue, which was touched upon in the Amendment. They assured people that they were going to protect their employment and give them more work, while they raised revenue by admitting foreign goods. That sounded like a paradox, and yet it was not so much a paradox as it seemed. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had failed to realise how exceedingly difficult it was to keep manufactured goods out of any country. An average 10 per cent. duty would probably not keep out more than 5 or 2½ per cent of the manufactures which now came in. [Hear, hear.] Hon. Gentlemen opposite said "Hear, hear," and he was glad to hear it. If they really cheered that, would they be good enough to remind their constituents that they did not expect an average 10 per cent. duty, which was propounded at Glasgow, to keep manufactured goods out of the country? Their constituents would know then what to expect. What would it do? They knew very well it would raise prices. He did not assert for a single moment that it would raise them by precisely 10 per cent., but that it would raise them all round there was no manner of doubt whatever. On the point of the difficulty of keeping manufactured goods out of a country, he would direct the attention of hon. Gentlemen to the fact that the Dingley tariff of America failed to keep out of the United States of America a quantity of manufactured goods which was as large as that imported into the United Kingdom; as a matter of fact the imports of manufactured goods into the United States of America for the first three months of this year were almost of the same value as the imports of manufactured goods into the United Kingdom. That showed that the greater part of the manufactured goods imported into any country under any fiscal system was absolutely necessary to its industries and must be imported, whatever tariff they liked to impose, or whatever fiscal system they enjoyed or did not enjoy. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, although they had not asserted it in that House, had, wherever they could get a hearing, told the people in the country that it was the foreigner who paid the import duties; and he believed that the introduction of the words "broaden the basis of taxation" into the Amendment would be interpreted in the country to mean that the basis was to be broadened until the foreigner was included. That part of the Amendment which related to revenue was only worth serious consideration at all if it could be shown in the long run and on the average that the foreigner paid the import duties. How could hon. Gentlemen opposite reconcile that theory with the fact that in every protectionist country, practically without exception, manufacturers who re-exported any article containing either raw material or partly manufactured or wholly manufactured material which had previously paid duty on importation, had the duty returned to them by the country which was supposed not to pay it? Was that not conclusive as to the ordinary view which was taken of import duties by business men? He might point out that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, when he introduced his proposals, said he had no intention of ruining the industries of this country by taxing raw materials. We produced a not inconsiderable amount of raw materials ourselves. If the importation into any country of any considerable quantity of raw material caused the foreigner to lower his price to an extent which might be represented as paying an import duty, it would be our duty not only to tax food but to tax raw materials in order to give preference to the Colonies. He might give another practical illustration of the incidence of import duties. The United States under their scientific system of tariffs had to set up courts and assessors to deal with the question of duties in detail. For instance, the United States produced 25,000,000 dollars worth of zinc ore a year, but it also had to import a large quantity, and they found a firm of importers anxiously fighting before the court whether zinc sulphide was a raw material or a manufacture and whether it should pay no duty or 20 per cent. Why was this firm fighting the question if the foreigner paid the import duty? What did it matter in such a case whether the duty was 20 or 50 per cent.? The truth was that the business man looked upon an import duty just as he did upon any other element in the cost of production. It must be an element in price. It was perfectly true that when an import duty was placed on an article, just as much as when a raw material rose in price, the change might not make itself at once apparent in the price of the article as it reached the consumer. Last year, roughly speaking, raw materials went up 10 per cent.; did the price to the consumer go up? Not at once, but the prices of manufactured articles rose gradually, were rising now, and would continue to rise. At first the increased cost of manufacture and of materials could not be passed on to the consumer. The same might be said of an import duty, and he was sure that hon. Members who would consider the matter from purely business considerations would not argue in their constituencies that it was possible to tax the foreigner. He took great exception, as he had explained before, to the use of the words, "the broadening of the basis of taxation." There was only one basis of taxation, and that basis was the national dividend which consisted of the whole product of the work of the nation. That was the true basis, and one could neither widen nor narrow it. If it was not possible to tax the foreigner the Chancellor of the Exchequer had to tax the people of his own country, and the only election open to the right hon. Gentleman was as to what class of goods or people he should levy his tax, and as to the means which they had to pay the tax. What he considered to be the chief consideration which he had to put before the House in connection with this Budget was this—that while it had been demonstrated that this country was increasingly prosperous and wealthy, the greater proportion of the people were propertyless people who had no tangible assets, and the sole factors between them and destitution were the health and strength which they possessed. He did not want to weary the House with figures, which were always tedious, but if he were to take a page of the Order Paper of the House and tear off a small corner, what was left would represent the property of 5,000,000 people, while the piece he had torn off would represent that of 39,000,000 people. That and similar facts were what the Chancellor of the

Exchequer had to face. When he looked at the Finance Bill and at the Amendment which had been proposed, his mind was not so much fixed upon the fiscal question which it had been his misfortune to discuss so often, but upon the considerations which must be in the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he proposed to apply taxation to the people under the circumstances he had indicated. This brought him to the savings of the poor, in regard to which a statement of the hon. Member for Woolwich had been challenged by the hon. Member for the City of London, who assured the House that the rich were very poor and the poor were very rich. The hon. Gentleman pointed to the millions of money which were possessed by trade unions or lodged with friendly societies. Did the House really know what these millions were? What did they really mean? The few shillings, the few pounds that were stored up in the trade unions and friendly societies and such-like bodies, merely represented the premiums which had been paid to save the man from destitution when he got out of work, to keep him going in a small way when he got ill, and to pay his burial expenses when he entered into the possession of that bit of soil which was the only piece he was ever likely to have the privilege of possessing. That was the real meaning of the savings of the poor, and when they came to building societies it was a fact that a great part of the savings were not those of manual labourers, but those of the middle classes and even of professional men. Max O'Rell had said that the average Englishwoman's method of making an apple pie was to take "some" flour, "some" water, "some" fat, "some" apples, and so on, without any precise regard for quantities. As a result, sometimes one got apple pie and sometimes an indigestible conglomeration. So Chancellors of the Exchequer took "some" individuals and "some" duties, such as those on tea, sugar, and so forth, without the slightest idea of what individuals were to pay the duties. Surely it was time we dropped rule of thumb and had regard to the means of taxpayers. This Finance Bill recognised, perhaps more fully than any previous Budget, that there was a common sense difference between income which was earned by the individual worker by the work of his own hand or brain, and the income derived from property. That was a tremendous principle to have recognised, although it was not recognised sufficiently. The differentiation which was proposed did not really touch the great mass of incomes which were derived from property, and did not sufficiently recognise the distinction between money derived from exertions and income derived from such sources as land or capital. The only commonsense way to differentiate the income-tax was to graduate it. The great mass of unearned incomes was at the top of the scale and they did not touch it by specific differentiation of small incomes. It was not worth while to pursue little incomes derived from property. As incomes grew in size more and more of them was derived from property; therefore graduation was the true differentiation. He thought it was high time that regard should be had to the fact that in spite of the wealth of the country there was an enormous number of the people who were not taxable subjects at all. The principle of no representation without taxation could be pressed too far. After the scientific investigations that had taken place everyone would be convinced that with all our wealth there was probably one-third of our population on or near or under a poverty line arrived at on the basis of the workhouse dietary. His constituency contained a spot of fifteen acres loaded with about 7,500 human beings the average income of each of whom was well under 25s. a week when they could get it, and they did not always get it. Were they taxable subjects? No. Why? Because they did not receive sufficient to enable them to sustain physical efficiency to say nothing of being able to obtain luxuries and enjoyment. He submitted that they should be regarded as subjects who were not taxable unless they cared to tax themselves. He did not suggest that the tax should be taken off drink and tobacco. On the contrary those taxes should be left on. The principle should be adopted that these people were not taxable unless they taxed themselves by buying these things. To carry that out would necessitate the removal of the tea duty and the sugar duty and other indirect taxes now levied. The tea duty must go because tea was one of the most innocent luxuries of the poor and helped a woman to get through her work, and because in taking it off they would assist temperance. The sugar duty must go because it was not only an article of large consumption among the poor, but a raw material in many of our industries. He passed to the question of old age pensions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had laid it down as a principle that they should be non-contributory, and he agreed; but if they paid pensions through food duties they would in a real sense be contributory. If people had to buy taxed sugar was it not the same thing as if they had to pay no duty on sugar but 4d. a week for a pension? The sugar tax amounted to 16s. a head per annum, and so long as that was maintained old age pensions would be contributory. The hon. Member for Preston had laid down the principle that the employer ought to contribute, the employer who had the use of the man during his working hours and who could discharge him at a moment's notice. He agreed to that also, but if they had a properly graduated income-tax they would make the contribution of the employing classes so that that end of the hon. Gentleman would be served. In all these matters they must have regard to the practical limits of taxation. They must not begin to trench on the amount of capital saved in the country every year, and which was devoted to the establishment of new or the expansion of old businesses, and to the general welfare of the community. That was obvious, but they need not fear that the grant of old age pensions would diminish capital saving. It was years ago said by Professor Marshall that probably £100,000,000 a year was wasted by the working classes, and £400,000,000 a year by the rich, in a manner which contributed nothing to the welfare of the country. Were those estimates extravagant? Certainly not. He stated with confidence that Professor Marshall had full warrant for what he said. Let them take the wealth of the rich people of this country at the present time. It was so large as to be extraordinary. The extraordinary luxury of the country had even attracted the attention of Bishops. A graduated income-tax, rising to 1s. 6d. or 2s., would by no means trench on capital savings, or cause any risk to the trade and the credit of the country. The financial strength of the nation was imperfectly realised. It was only a few years since that we entered into a war which cost £220,000,000, which, from an economic point of view, he thought might have been better employed in some other way. Only a few years had passed since then, and never had the trade of this country, its total production, and the income of its employers of labour been greater. They knew that the trade of the country at the present time was, in spite of the war, in a most flourishing condition. The financial position of the country had thus been demonstrated in a very remarkable way, and he did not think that that strength was sufficiently appreciated. He submitted that if the needs of the time and the conscience of the nation demanded it we could safely increase our national expenditure for social purposes. He thanked the House for the great kindness with which it had listened to him.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down was full of information, and though they did not all agree with him, they listened to his observations with interest. But the hon. Member had posed, as was often done on the opposite side of the House, as one of the exclusive friends of the working classes; but he repudiated the implied suggestion that they who were on the Opposition side of the House were not equally anxious and willing to safeguard the interests of the poorer classes in connection with taxation. They might differ from hon. Gentlemen opposite as to the methods to be adopted, but he did not think that any hon. Gentleman would insinuate that there was less inclination on that side of the House to safeguard the interests of the poorer classes than there was among supporters of the Government. The hon. Member had dwelt very eloquently on the luxury and great expenditure of the richer classes of the country. Were such references as that to be used as arguments, seeing that the great mass of taxation under the present Budget was upon commodities mainly used by the poorer classes? The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire had been accused of not giving any definite details of what his scheme would be. But he thought the Opposition were entitled to ask hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the Government Bench what was the remedy for the very large and growing expenditure which must inevitably come in respect of the promises made not only in that House but in the country. The hon. Member had admitted that 10 per cent. or a less duty on manufactured goods could not keep them out. That was a very considerable admission from so consistent and vigorous an advocate of free trade, and perhaps would not be lost sight of by those who took part in the debate. As regarded the question of colonial preference, he wished, if possible, to ascertain from the Government what their attitude was towards that subject, and what they intended to do in the matter of future taxation to meet the great expenditure which had been foreshadowed. The Postmaster-General had said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire was like a conjuror with a hat, from which he was to bring a rabbit, but the rabbit was not forthcoming. But hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to him to be like a conjuror who violently waved a hat in the air and showed that there was nothing in it. They could not expect the audience to be very much impressed by that. What they wanted to know was where the sources of revenue were to be found, when, as was perfectly evident from his Budget, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was pretty well at the end of his tether. The President of the Board of Education had drawn a touching picture of the condition of the poor of the country, and had said that the object of Members of the Opposition was to tax the poorer classes, and even the imported boots and shoes of the wives and children. He did not see why they held it to be a greater hardship to tax boots and shoes when they taxed tea and sugar, which were just as much used, and the tax on which pressed just as heavily on the poor as a tax on boots and shoes. Taxation in the end fell on the poorer classes of the community, and what they all wanted was to see adumbrated some system by which they would levy taxation more on articles of luxury used by the richer classes who were better able to afford it, than, as seemed to be the proposal of the Government, on those commodities which were used mainly by the poorest classes of the community. The President of the Board of Education had pointed to the great increase of wages in 1906, and had remarked that the revenue of the country was so elastic, and the prospects of trade were so good, that we should not be in any financial difficulty in the near future. But the right hon. Gentleman had not pointed out that that was a mere boom in trade which was being experienced in other countries besides our own; it was a temporary phase of trade, which fluctuated, as the Returns showed, in every country of the world. It was very rash to draw from that boom in trade any definite rule as to what might happen in the near future, or to establish upon it any definite basis for a permanent system of taxation. What struck him particularly about the debate was the breezy hopefulness with which hon. Gentlemen opposite attacked this question. It reminded one of the spirit of the early Christian martyrs who faced all the possibilities of their fate; similarly, hon. Gentlemen opposite said that they had no fear, and that whatever the expenditure before them might be, they put their trust in a good providence with no apprehension as to what would happen. He would like the House to consider what the expenditure was in regard to which they were asking for fresh sources of taxation. Partly by recent legislation, and partly by recent speeches and by utterances during the general election, they were promised an increase in the bureaucracy of the country. They had been promised an increase in the number of inspectors; and anybody who had discussed the possible schemes of hon. Members opposite connected with such subjects as small holdings and the better housing of the working classes must recognise at a glance that an increase of expenditure was inevitable in the rural districts. Unless a heavy increase was to be put on the rates—and he did not think that any hon. Gentlemen who knew the rural districts would wish to see that—considerable assistance would have to be given from the Imperial Exchequer to carry out those projects. Then they had schemes for the payment of Members, payment of railway fares, and other expenses for matters which would conduce to the comfort of their existence in that House. They would also have the rush of extra shipbuilding, which must come if hon. Gentlemen opposite were prepared to cut down the shipbuilding programme now. The history of the country showed that whenever there had been a lull in shipbuilding for the Navy, the time shortly afterwards arrived when there was a panic, and the shipbuilding was increased to an undue extent. In addition there was the expenditure of £650,000 needed for the new Irish Council. They were face to face with the grant to Jamaica, which must certainly diminish the surplus which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was relying on for next year. In addition to that, they had the proposal for old age pensions, which, it seemed to him, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had entered upon so lightly. The ordinary man in the street regarded the old age pension as 5s. a week at the age of sixty-five, and it was not for a moment to be supposed that they could have any final or speedy solution of the question with the sum the Chancellor of the Exchequer had at his disposal. Everybody knew, as was admitted by the President of the Local Government Board, that the full cost of a scheme of the kind would cost £29,000,000; even making the deductions proposed by the Hamilton Committee, the cost would be more than £12,000,000. Those deductions, however, must be difficult to carry out, and in any case an enormous sum of money would be involved. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had earmarked £2,250,000, and he expected to get another £600,000 out of the death duties. That seemed to him to be a sanguine estimate as regarded the death duties, because they must take into account that generation after generation there would be more evasions of the tax. Already they had instances of arrangements by which the burden of the death duty was evaded, and the yield was more likely to become smaller than greater. But supposing the whole of that sum from the death duties was realised, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have about £3,000,000 a year. It was clear that that sum would be perfectly inadequate to meet the demand for old age pensions. What was the fresh taxation to which they were to look to help the Government out of their difficulty? They had heard from various quarters that they were to be taxed more. It was impossible to raise £20,000,000 out of taxation alone. The Front Government Bench had not given them a really serious idea of what their suggestions would be, but they had heard certain suggestions from hon. Gentlemen below the gangway or elsewhere. The hon. Member for South Hackney had suggested various measures for broadening the basis of taxation; whether the Government would adopt them he did not know, but the hon. Gentleman had suggested, among other things, taxes upon theatre tickets, advertisements, etc., as a fruitful source of revenue. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had been accused of endeavouring to tax the food of the poor. By maintaining the present taxes upon tea and sugar the Chancellor of the Exchequer was doing the very thing which had been advanced as the worst accusation against the policy advocated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham. Unless the Government could tell them where they proposed to look to for their necessary revenue in the future they would be providing the strongest possible argument by this Budget in favour of tariff reform. If that was the result, the Government would only have themselves to thank.

*Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said that no man would envy the Chancellor of the Exchequer who had to make up his mind what classes were to be beneficiaries under his Budget. The Labour Party were profoundly dissatisfied with the choice he had made, because they considered that one class had an unanswerable claim, and that class was the old people of sixty-five years of age who had not enough property to keep them out of the workhouse, or to enable them to live without charitable assistance. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that perhaps next year he would consider the claims of those old people, and that he had, in fact, set aside £2,250,000 as a nucleus or a sort of reservoir from which he could draw, provided everything went well. He did not desire to discount the promises made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; he believed they were genuinely made; but his difficulty was that many other right hon. Gentlemen equally honest had made the same promise. It looked as though upon this subject they were going to get promises until time had sounded its last knell. They were told that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer's estimate came out as he anticipated, if trade remained as good as it was at the present time, next year they might find themselves discussing a practical scheme of old age pensions. They were tired of promises and were going to accept no more. Moreover, they were anxious to find out what the scheme of old age pensions was going to be. The President of the Local Government Board the other day gave them certain very interesting figures on the subject, and he classified the poor into independent and dependent poor. He presumed they would not be doing the right hon. Gentleman any injustice if they assumed that that classification indicated the direction in which the Government's mind was running. Did they imagine that the working classes would accept a scheme of old age pensions which was not going to relieve the old people who were now living upon the Poor Law? That at any rate was what was suggested by the speech of the President of the Local Government Board. The sooner the Government dispossessed their mind of that idea the better, because the Labour Party were not willing to accept or even to associate themselves in any way with a scheme which differentiated between the poor at sixty-five who had been compelled to resort to the Poor Law and those who had not. They would never regard a proposal of that kind as in any sense satisfactory. When the pledge was given in an old-fashioned general sort of way that they were going to have old age pensions next year they were just as interested in being told what the scheme was as hearing the oft repeated promise once more. Whilst the class which they thought ought to be the first beneficiaries under a Liberal Budget was waiting to be dealt with, a much more well-to-do class was going to receive substantial benefit under the provisions of this Finance Bill. The people with incomes of from 3 guineas to £40 a week were going to receive substantial relief to the extent of from 3d. to £25 per annum. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer meant to redeem some of the pledges given at the election he ought not to have chosen for those benefits the people receiving from 3 guineas to £40 per week, but should have devoted his attention to the old people of sixty-five years of age who were struggling to keep themselves outside the workhouse. Surely they ought to have been chosen instead of the middle classes who were being benefited by this Budget. It was very extraordinary that a Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer had selected for relief a class whose incomes had been going up by leaps and bounds during recent industrial developments. The people who had been suffering reductions of income and wages were the very people who had to wait for another period of twelve months before any relief was promised. It was quite true there were certain good beginnings in the Budget, but he thought it was an exceedingly feeble attempt to do the right thing. With regard to the Amendment he thought it really meant nothing whatever. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire, in his speech, gave voice to all sorts of notions of taxation. One moment he had advocated protection in order that British industry might increase in bulk, and at another moment he had advocated a tariff which would contribute substantially to the revenue of the country and supply funds for old age pensions. Then the right hon. Gentleman had invited their attention to colonial preference, telling them that they ought to invent some tariff which would give the Colonies a substantial preference in our Home market. Then he had passed on to retaliation and reciprocity, and after that he seemed to have mixed up all his schemes together. It was quite possible that all those schemes could be mixed up together, but if they tried to devise a system which would be protective to industries, which would increase the revenue and increase the demand for home labour, and at the same time offer preference to the Colonies and retaliation, and enable this country to bargain with foreign countries, then they would get a minimum of each and not a maximum. From the point of view of protection and revenue that sort of hybrid system of tariff reform yielded so little benefit that they might discount it altogether in the Budgets brought up year after year. He felt certain that they could not decrease their expenditure. He did not think any section of the House hoped to reduce the present scale of national expenditure to any material extent. They might save upon the Army and Navy and in other directions, but every 6d. which they managed to save would be spent in other directions. The total expenditure of the country was not going to be reduced to any appreciable extent. He thought it rather a pity that the Leader of the Opposition did not take alarm at the increase in expenditure before that £220,000,000 was spent on the South African war, which debt was now lying like a millstone round the necks of the people. But it did not matter how large the expenditure was, they ought to levy the taxes in a scientific way. The Amendment proposed that the basis of taxation should be broadened, but in his opinion that basis was now as broad as it possibly could be. There was not a single family in the country that did not pay taxes. There was not a single man or woman who consumed tea or sugar, however insignificant their income, whether a pauper or independent worker, who did not contribute something towards the revenue of the country. It was a melancholy and lamentable fact that the poorer they were the heavier taxation pressed upon them. There were people whose incomes were so small that they could not keep themselves in an adequate state of physical efficiency, and yet those people had to pay taxes on tea, sugar, and tobacco, equivalent to the taxes paid by the richest consumer. What they complained of was that the basis of taxation was too broad at the present time, for they taxed people who ought not to be taxed, and they taxed incomes every farthing of which ought to be spent in keeping their possessors in a state of physical efficiency. They were taxing family incomes which ought to be spent to the very last farthing upon feeding and clothing the children and bringing proper facilites within their scope and command. At the present time the working classes, whose incomes averaged £70, were paying something like £48,000,000 to the National Exchequer. There was not a sensible man in the House who would not say that that basis ought to be narrowed. The pyramid ought to be based not on its broad basis but on its apex. The time had come when the Chancellor of the Exchequer in national finance had to work out a pyramid of taxation, raised not upon its broad basis, which was oppressive and crushing, but upon its apex, which would enable the pyramid to lie on that small section of the community who held property which was social in its origin and which ought to be spent on social purposes. If they took the figure he had just quoted, namely, the £48,000,000 contributed by the working classes to the national income, it worked out at 2s. in the pound income-tax. If they considered the final utility of 2s. in the pound to a man whose income was anything between 15s. and £1 a week, and worked that out, they got an equivalent in final utility to a man whose income was £5,000 of probably something like £2,000. It was not a question of amount of money; it was a question of final utility—the question of discovering the equivalent to people who had enormous incomes to the tax of 2s. income-tax in the pound which the working classes had to pay. At the present time the income-tax upon the working classes was a tax upon life, not upon property; and he submitted that what the Chancellor had to discover was how to remove all taxes upon life and place them upon property. The question one would like to see answered was how right hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House would readjust the incidence of taxation. The proposal was that something should be taken off tea and tobacco, and that something should be put on cheese, meat, flour, and bread. The proposal was not that the volume of taxation should be reduced, but that what was now imposed should be split up into small particles and that those particles on the whole should be equivalent to what was now being paid. He ventured to say that that was rather a futile result. If they were going to relieve people of taxes, let that be done, but let them not merely split the taxes up and then in the aggregate take away as much from them as before. Broadening the basis of taxation as defined by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, was that more commodities should be brought within the net of the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but that simply meant that they were taxing trade, and there was nothing more objectionable than a tax upon trade. That limited industry. Moreover, though they might appear to be taxing things consumed, ultimately the incomes of the people had to bear the tax, and that in the most objectionable way, because they had to bear it not in relation to the ability to bear, but in relation to the use which the holders of the incomes made of the various commodities they had to use. No more objectionable system of taxation could be devised than that method of broadening the basis of taxation, because it meant that an increasing number of articles would have to bear taxation than at present, and from the point of view of the working classes that was infinitely worse even than the present bad system. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham promulgated this scheme for breaking up taxation and levying it in small homeopathic doses on many commodities; but even on the platform he confessed the working classes would only be helped to the tune of nine or ten farthings. That was no relief of taxation. If the proposal made in the Amendment did not reduce taxation, what about its Imperial aspect? The right hon. Gentleman in his speech yesterday had laid special emphasis upon the Imperial aspect of his proposal; he had told the House that we ought to reciprocate the commercial offers of the Colonies, and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, later on had described those offers as being important. As there was to be an opportunity of discussing those proposals later on, it would not be necessary to go into details now, but he was bound to take that opportunity of saying that he thought those offers and proposals would be much more important than they were if they had been a little more detailed and a little more definite, and if they had been conveyed in pounds, shillings, and pence—if they had been conveyed in schedules rather than in grandiloquent periods and general language which might or might not be capable of application to our commercial conditions. But he took this objection. Why should we, simply because the Colonies asked us, change our fiscal system? Why should they not change their fiscal system upon our invitation? Was it going to be a one-sided bargain altogether? Was that how right hon. Gentlemen did business? If the Colonies offered something, were right hon. Gentlemen going to accept that offer without consideration as to whether it was valuable in itself or not? Was His Majesty's Government going to be accused of pursuing a wrong policy because it insisted on discussing the value of the proposals made to it by business men and apparently for business ends? He read a leading article in the *Melbourne Age* the other day, which wound up with a statement to the effect—

> "We are offering preference, not only because we want to show our love for the Mother Country, but because we are convinced that the Mother Country requires it for business purposes, and we are also convinced that if the Mother Country does not adopt a new fiscal policy the Mother Country's business will disappear as it is rapidly disappearing."

He thought that must have been written some years ago. Certainly it must have been written by somebody who had not the most recent trade returns published. If those things were true, if there was any foundation for these statements, they were statements which could be discussed from two sides. Surely they ought to be the subject of discussion on the part of the preferentialists and protectionists on the one hand, and the free traders on the other. It was simply absurd for anybody to say that, because the Colonies, acting upon ideas of protection, offered us certain preferences, and because we turned to them and said, "We believe that free trade suits our purpose better; we believe that free trade is a better economic foundation for the Empire than preference or protection," we were not Imperialists, that we were not taking an interest in the Empire, and that we were aiding and abetting dismemberment and dissolution. If they were going to allow the people of the Empire to decide, then the majority of the people were in this country. The most important business centre of the Empire was still in this country, and if there was going to be a public appeal in regard to the economic interests of the Empire the matter was not going to be settled by people outside the Mother Country but by people inside. The people who voted in the recent elections were not going to be called anti-imperial and told that they were indifferent to imperial interests because they had decided, and he thought decided well, that free trade was to be the basis of the fiscal policy of the mother land.

They were told that they did not even go the length of taking off in favour of the Colonies some duties which were now imposed on imports. If the Colonies would be satisfied with that he was not sure but that the suggestion might at any rate be considered on its merits. There was no general formula of fiscal policy or a tariff creed that was from the beginning and was going to remain true until the end of things. Everyone of the elements of our fiscal dogmas had to be decided generation after generation as circumstances changed. Hon. Members above the gangway did not monopolise the free mind. Hon. Members who were on the other side measured the success of their policy year after year and generation after generation, and they stood by free trade not because Cobden preached it, but because it was beneficial to us at the present time, and because it was going to be beneficial to the country for a considerable time to come. He did not believe that preference would encourage the Colonies to trade with us, or that our trade with the Colonies would thereby be affected to any considerable extent. Had the Premier of Australia given us any pledge that if we lowered duties on Colonial imports upon our present tariff schedules he would be satisfied? Had the Premier of Canada given us any assurance that that would satisfy him? It was quite true that South Africa would be rather pleased with it, but South Africa was in a peculiar position. South Africa was mainly interested in wines and tobacco, and a change in the present tariff would suit South Africa in a special degree. But what would it mean to this country? It would be the beginning of the principle of protection. Our tariff policy was not to be dictated by the opinion of a majority of the Colonies. At least he hoped it had not come to that yet. There were three views of taxation; they might either tax articles of general consumption, which was the protectionist theory; or they might tax property, or combine a tax on consumption and property. The Labour Party held that all taxation on articles of consumption should be removed because they bore oppressively upon the poorer classes of the community, and that taxes should be levied upon wealth that had not been earned by individual service. The values created not by individuals but by the community should be transferred to the community and not allowed to be enjoyed by individuals who had not earned them by service. Industrial capital and wages ought to be free altogether from taxation. The State should claim as its property the value of that which it had created. If after that revenue was still required, incomes and other property should be taxed. The Labour Party would not support the Amendment because they believed not in broadening but in narrowing the basis of taxation. The Amendment had really been framed in a light-hearted, sympathetic, and lightsome moment by men who wanted to meet the demands of Colonies who do not understand our tariff policies, whose economic conditions differed from ours, whose markets were not our markets, and whose competition was totally different from that which we had to meet.

MR. MALLET (Plymouth) said that everyone admitted that the Imperial aspect of this great business question was the most attractive, and perhaps the only attractive, aspect which it had; but that there was nothing in the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite to show how Imperial feeling could be strengthened by increasing the taxation on articles of large consumption, or, in other words, on the necessaries of life. It was perfectly clear that there was one ground on which tariff reform was advocated which could not be properly maintained. Speeches had been made from the Opposition side which advanced the theory that we owed it to our Colonies to make them some further return for the preference they offered us, but he thought that that view was neither tenable nor fair When they remembered that the preference offered by the Colonies was still very limited in extent—Sir William Lyne said that the Australian proposals only applied to 8 per cent. of Australian imports, and that even then British goods going to the Australian Colonies must be carried in British ships manned by white labour, a condition which millions of our fellow subjects had a strong right to resent: when they remembered that the Colonies still imposed high protective tariffs on most of our goods, whilst we in return offered them, on everything they sent us, a liberality of treatment which no other nation in the world offered them, and which they never dreamt of offering us; and when they remembered that we, unaided, bore the whole burden of Imperial defence; surely it was not fair to urge that we were required to make any further return to our Colonies. After all, in any bargain between ourselves and our Colonies, we were and must remain their creditors, offering them far more than we could ever look for in return. That was the nature of all bargains between parents and children, and he thought that in all such bargains this policy of haggling was a grave mistake. As long as the Empire held together, the Colonies would always owe a debt to the generosity of the English people, but that was no reason why they should impose on that generosity, as Gentlemen opposite would have them do, an intolerable strain. Mr. Lowe once said in a passage of illuminating pessimism that we lost half our Colonies by trying to tax them, and that we should lose the other half by their trying to tax us; and he suggested to hon. Gentleman opposite, who loved the extremities of the Empire, but who minimised, he thought, the claims of the heart of the Empire, that, if they laid down the principle that we could only keep our Colonies by submitting to impositions on our food, and interference with our freedom, they ran the risk of making the Empire not the pride, but the bugbear, of the English people. He wished tariff reformers would tell them in more detail how they could possibly reconcile their proposals with what they believed to be the needs of our own people. Free traders had always insisted that they could not give any colonial preference worth having without taxation of corn, but that was a point on which they had never been able to ascertain definitely the views of the Leader of the Opposition. They had always insisted also that it involved a tax on raw materials, but they had never yet been able to get a definite pronouncement on that point from the Protectionist Leader. Gentlemen opposite had shirked these definite points, on which the whole meaning of their policy depended, and instead of facing them had urged the House to try to do something for the Colonies on the basis of existing taxation, so that they might drift imperceptibly into abandoning free trade. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, had complained that the Government had refused to take our existing duties and to try to offer a little preference upon them. The right hon. Gentleman had said it was ridiculous to go into details and he quite agreed it was so, because when one began to go into details one saw how ridiculous that proposal was. He did not know whether anyone had noticed the recent arrangements in Australia for giving a preference to South Africa in regard to the trade between the two Colonies, but there were one or two points in them which were significant. There had been a great increase in the use of agricultural machinery in Australia, and they had been buying their harvesters principally from Canada, which were imported at a duty of £5. Last year the duty was raised to £12, and at the same time a handsome preference was offered to South Africa in regard to harvesters imported from that country to Australia. How did the protectionist party in Australia justify that preference to South Africa? They justified it on the ground that South Africa did not send any harvesters to Australia at all. A preference was also given by Australia to South African wines, and that was justified on the ground that the people in Australia did not like and did not drink South African wines. The fact was, when one looked into the details of these preferences, it very often happened that the preference was little more than a pretence. Let them take the case of Canada and consider for an instant what we could have done for Canada on the basis of existing duties. It was said we might have made a beginning and gone into the Conference and offered something. What did that mean? On the basis of existing duties we could offer nothing to Canada on her great exports, timber, corn, bacon and cheese; we could only offer her a preference on certain dutiable articles such as tobacco, sugar, tea, coffee, cocoa, wines and spirits, and dried fruits. If the House looked at the details it would be seen how absurd such suggestions were. As to tea Canada only sent us £999 worth in 1905; and that could not be Canadian, because Canada did not grow it; a preference on tea could not therefore benefit her. Again our imports of sugar from Canada were only of the value of a few thousand pounds, and there again it could not be said that that import offered much scope for preference. The import of tobacco from Canada was worth only £9,000, while wine and spirits only amounted to £10,000. Coffee she sent none; cocoa only £1,100 worth, and dried fruits practically none. From these figures it was obvious that, on the basis of existing duties, the opportunity of giving a preference to Canada, the margin for "broadening the basis of taxation," was comparatively small. This great Dominion came to us and offered us in a friendly and generous spirit concessions on our manufactures which hon. Gentlemen opposite rated very high. Did they seriously mean to answer: "We will give you a preference on nothing of any importance which you sell, but only on a few trumpery articles which are not really Canadian at all." The same thing might be said with equal truth in regard to the other Colonies. They had had references to South Africa, and they were told that they might do something by giving a preference on South African tobacco and South African wine. The amount of tobacco which we got from South Africa was infinitesimal, and did not amount to £1,900 a year, and the amount of wine imported last year was very little more. The hon. Member for Gravesend always spoke with authority on Colonial matters, but he must always be regarded even when he spoke of Imperial economics as first and foremost a master of romance. The hon. Member had told them that if Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Cobden had left the wine of South Africa alone, and if it had not been for the Treaty of 1859, the trade in the wine of that country might have grown to large dimensions. Of course it was all the fault of that wicked Mr. Cobden, who was responsible for so much evil, and also for such wonderful prosperity in this country. But in 1905 the importation of South African wine was only worth £8,500; in 1906 it had shrunk to some £2,000; and here they got no opportunity of broadening the basis of taxation. In regard to Australian wines, there was some better scope for a preference, but would any preference ever make those wines a competitor with the products of Portugal or France. Australia sent us hardly any tea or tobacco, but she did send us a certain amount of wine. In 1905, it amounted to as much as £136,000, but last year it fell to £100,000; and there there was perhaps a limited opportunity of showing good-will to Australia, if we were willing to shut our eyes to the principle of free trade. But the fact was, we did not buy Australian wines because we did not drink them, and he doubted whether they were drunk even at the banquets of tariff reformers. Erasmus once said that he could not fast on Fridays, because while his heart was Catholic, his stomach was Protestant, and in the same way he suspected that while the appetites of tariff reformers were Imperial, their palates owned the heresies of Cobden still. Moreover, Australia was of all our Colonies the most rigidly protectionist, the most determined, by tariffs or bounties, to keep her own market for herself. Would that resolution be changed by a trumpery preference on Australian wines? To have gone into the Colonial Conference expressing a willingness to grant preference on the basis of existing duties without intending to go on would have been to play a dishonest game. Imperial unity would never be built up on any scheme of pooling Parliaments or pooling trade, or on a fiscal system which added intolerably to the burdens of the people. It was because by relying on those specifics, the Party opposite had turned the strong current of Imperial feeling into mistaken channels that he resisted these preference proposals whatever shape or form they took.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): The hon. Member for Plymouth concluded his speech by accusing the party to which I belong of having directed the stream of patriotic emotion, which might have been directed into better channels, into the channel of preference, which in his view can produce, in the long run, no good consequences either to this country or to our Colonies. The hon. Gentleman does us more than justice. It is not we, it is the Colonies, those great self-governing communities in which the hon. Gentleman professes, and I doubt not with perfect truth, an interest as great as that felt by any of my hon. friends, who turned the stream of patriotic emotion into that channel. And the complaint we make against His

Majesty's Government, and against their supporters in and out of the House, is that they have ignored through all these years the offers made to us by those communities, that they have sheltered themselves behind self-made rules of finance which have, to my mind, no solid basis either in scientific or in applied economics, and that they have, in consequence of these limitations, put it absolutely out of their power, when they met the Colonial Prime Ministers in conference only a few days ago, to do anything in the direction which the Colonies desire. There is, I believe, one exception. There is, or has been, a suggestion made that there should be a preference in shipping, or that there should be a shipping subsidy, or some expedient of that kind. I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, and who is an ardent economist of a certain school, regards that as consistent with free trade as he understands free trade; and, if he does not, I wonder whether he is going to make the same eloquent speech in denouncing it, if it should ever come before the House, as he has just made in denouncing other schemes which are certainly no more inconsistent with free trade than this. I suppose the Chancellor of the Exchequer will tell us, or indicate, when he comes to deal with this branch of the question, what it is the Government really do propose with regard to shipping subsidies, and will give us the opportunity of practically testing exactly what it is that they mean when they talk of supporting "the theory of free trade." We have often tried to find out, but we have not always succeeded; and I remember that when a Motion was moved on the subject last session they very wisely closured the debate after two days discussion, because they found themselves wholly unable to explain the meaning of the phrase. The discussion has very naturally, and I think very rightly, ranged over a wide surface. We have not only dealt with the question placed before us by my right hon. friend's Amendment, but some speakers have also discussed various outlying portions of the same great theme, and discussed them in many cases with great clearness and ability. We have had a sketch Budget of one character from the hon. Member for North Paddington. The hon. Member for Leicester gave us a sketch of another Budget on somewhat different lines, and we have departed, more or less, no doubt, from the perfectly narrow limits laid down by the Amendment, strictly interpreted. I think I shall probably best consult the convenience of the House if I confine the few observations I have to make to a survey of the condition of things with which that Amendment is intended specifically to deal. If we were merely discussing the question of colonial preference and the question of the propriety of possessing some power of bargaining with foreign countries, I should really have nothing to add to what I have often said to this audience and to other audiences. The reason I think it worth while to speak at all on this subject is not that I have anything to modify in any statement of principle I have ever laid down. It is not that I think those statements were ever lacking in clearness or precision or lucidity. [Ironical cheers.] It is not that I have changed them even by a hair's breadth. [Ironical cheers.] But it is that I think the Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, taken in combination with what we know to have passed at the meeting with the Colonial Premiers, gives new opportuneness, new force, and new applicability to the principles which I have ventured often to lay down as representing my own views and those of many of my friends. I heard ironical cheers just now when I said that I have never changed my opinions. Those ironical cheers came from Gentlemen who have never taken the trouble—I do not know whether it was worth their while—to master the views I have from time to time put forward; and among the people who have not taken that trouble I may count the Prime Minister, who spoke the other day at Manchester, and repeated, with his usual force, the oft-repeated charge that I had, as a matter of fact, modified my views from time to time, that I had, in accordance, as he suggested, with political exigencies and political pressure, changed opinions to which I have given expression and modified principles which I believe to be sound politically and economically. No man can say that who has read or listened to what I have at various times spoken on this subject, and who is at the same time gifted with ordinary powers of comprehension. The Prime Minister has powers of comprehension far above the ordinary, and I conclude, therefore, that he has, very wisely from many points of view, never taken the trouble to acquaint himself with the opinions which I and others hold on this subject. We have had the old battle-cry of protection and free trade raised again to-day. I am not going into that subject. If by protection is meant—and it is probably the most accurate, scientific meaning of that much-abused term—a policy which has for its object the diverting of the trade and commerce of a nation or of the world from its natural channels by artificial legislative means, that has never been, and is not now, any part of the policy which I recommend. I do not want to see grow up in this country industries which under natural and free conditions would have no chance of flourishing. I do not desire to see that policy carried out; and, that being my view, I think it perfectly absurd, from a scientific point of view, to describe my policy as a policy of protection. But let it be remembered that we are now dealing with a world which has evidently set itself determinedly to divert commerce and industry from its natural channels and to our disadvantage. When we hear the authority of Sir Robert Peel quoted, as we often do on these occasions, let us remember that Sir Robert Peel never contemplated anything distantly approaching the condition of things that we have got to deal with. I do not for a moment believe that he would have tolerated leaving this country absolutely without weapons for the purpose of negotiations when every other country, or almost every other country—every country, I believe, but Turkey—does as a matter of fact, endeavour artificially to divert the stream of manufactures and commerce in a direction hostile to our interests. And if you tell me that that is all a vain and useless endeavour, that these efforts made by foreign countries are doomed to lead to nothing, then I say, what is the value of your talk about the evils of protection and the evils of tariffs? The only reason that protective tariffs are bad is that they divert commerce. If you put on protective tariffs and they do not divert commerce, they do not have any of the evil consequences which hon. Gentlemen opposite assume. Therefore, I think we may say without paradox, what every sound economist admits, that we have to deal with a world in which the natural course of events is artificially perverted by every nation of the world, and it is folly not to arm ourselves, as far as we can be armed, with a weapon which will enable us to deal with that state of things. I have expressed clearly now, as I have always expressed clearly—I have often said it before, and it is perfectly clear to anybody acquainted with even the elements of economics—the view that I am a free-trader, and I am in favour of a weapon by which we can deal with hostile tariffs. Those are my first two propositions. The next proposition I would lay down is that colonial preference is a most valuable means of binding the Colonies together. That is one thing we ought to aim at. Doubtless there have been, and still are, after all that has happened, difficulties in the way; but those difficulties are difficulties which we should set ourselves to surmount, and not approach in the spirit of the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, and who, following His Majesty's Government, prejudged the whole question and issue by saying that the scheme is eminently so absurd that closer examination is not required and we will reject any possible policy which is based upon preference.

*MR. MALLET: I did not suggest that the entire policy of preference was ridiculous, though I should not be averse to arguing that. What I did say was that preference based on existing duties was, if you came to examine it, hopelessly ridiculous.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I accept the hon. Gentleman's correction. But even with that limitation I should wholly dispute his doctrine. Nothing, in my judgment, can be regarded as ridiculous in the way of a modification of our tariffs which commends itself to our great self-governing Colonies. The hon. Gentleman's view is that no preference based upon our existing duties, or any duties which the country would tolerate, could be of any use to the Colonies. Well, the Colonies are the best judge of that. When you have the Colonies coming, not once nor twice, not in one year only, but in a succession of years, and reiterating the same story and indulging in the same feelings, I think that a concession to those feelings ought not to be described, even in the most amiable spirit, as ridiculous. On the larger question, I have gone much further—and have always gone much further—than expressing my desire to see preference based upon existing tariffs. Before the controversy arose—I believe it was on the very day on which my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham made the speech which is usually, and, I think, very properly, regarded as the date when this great cause first came into evidence before the public eye—on that very day I expressed my views in favour of Colonial preference in the strongest and clearest language; and from that date, now four years ago, I have never varied, even by a fraction of an inch, on one side or the other. There is another proposition I have laid down, which is that, if you are to carry out this great national object of giving us a weapon to deal with foreign countries, and of giving us the means of preference, it is no reason for rejecting the plan that it may involve small Customs duties for which there is no counter-balancing excise. Such duties, of course, have a fractional protective effect, but I never suggested that they were put on for protection; I do not value them because they have a protective effect, I do not believe that the protective effect is material; and I appeal to the whole experience of the civilised world whether that is not a rational contention in matters of this kind. We do not call Turkey protective because it puts on a revenue duty, we do not call India protective because it puts on a revenue duty; and, if there is a sufficient reason for putting on duties for great national or Imperial objects, the mere fact that they may have the corresponding disadvantage of some slight protective effect is no reason why a sane and rational financier should reject them. And I do not believe there is a scientific economist in the world who would think that the statement that I have just made to the House has any element of paradox whatever in it. That is my fourth proposition. My fifth proposition, which I venture to press earnestly upon the House, is that, if you could obtain some preferential arrangement with the Colonies, which the Colonies thought worth giving something for in the way of advantage to our manufactures, you do make a clear and distinct step in the direction of free trade within the Empire. It is perfectly true that the full idea of free trade within the Empire may be an ideal which we never shall realise. The general tendency of civilised mankind seems to be going so strongly in favour of protection that I think probably it never may be reached, at any rate in our lifetime. But, if you are to have any approach to it, that approach can be obtained, and obtained only, as I think, by some arrangement of preferential duties within the Empire, by which our great manufacturing industries may obtain that market which, in spite of what optimists say, is going to be—probably within the experience of many whom I am now addressing—one of the great difficulties of a manufacturing country like ourselves, which must import largely from abroad, and must have large exports to pay for those imports. And observe that the advantage to be gained ought never to be measured by the immediate and present statistics of the moment. I think it was the hon. Member for North Paddington, following in the steps of many predecessors, who explained how our commerce with the Colonies was relatively so small that it was not worth our while, as it were, to make any important sacrifices to obtain a preferential footing in them. You have not to consider merely what a trade is now, and you have not to consider merely what the Colonies are now; you have to consider what the trade is going to be and what the Colonies are going to be. And when hon. Gentlemen dilate, as they often do, on the evils resulting from building up artificially great interests in any community on the basis of protection—I agree with their general theory—do they not see that, if we could in any respect prevent the building up of those great interests in certain departments of industry, and if there was the smallest prospect that we should be allowed in the future in these great and growing communities to introduce our manufactures on something like equality, on terms which would enable them, at all events, to compete in the Colonial market, we should be doing an enormous service to the manufacturing industry of this country, and we should be doing it on the strictest free trade lines and for free trade reasons? Well, that is the fifth of the propositions that I have laid down—all, I venture to say, perfectly clear and perfectly precise. I believe they are all absolutely consistent with sound economic theory; and I should not have taken the trouble to repeat them again to the House if it had not been that, in my judgment, two events have occurred since I last spoke in this House upon the subject which have a very great bearing, not upon the theory of the case, but upon the practical grounds on which statesmen modify their policy. Well, what are those two circumstances? One is the view given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech—endorsed by almost every speaker on the other side of the House—namely, the relation of our expenditure to our present means of taxation. Everybody admits that the expenditure of the country is very large. Some people think—I believe it is the old Radical orthodox view—that it is more than the country can stand. That is not the new view. The new view, expressed with great force by the Member for Leicester, and, I think, also by the Member for North Paddington, was that the expenditure of the country was very much less than the country could bear, and that it would undoubtedly require to be greatly increased. That is the new view. We have got a long way from the days of Joseph Hume. When we examine the Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer what do we find? Do we find that there is great latitude for future expenditure, even at the present rate of taxation? As I understand, the Chancellor of the Exchequer's position is this. He expects a surplus of £2,250,000 for the next year. This is to be a kind of nucleus for a scheme of old age pensions, which, we are told by another member of the Government, will require about £25,000,000 a year to satisfy. Just think of how precarious a tenure the right hon. Gentleman has of this £2,250,000. If the Education Bill had been carried last year he would have had to diminish the £2,250,000 by a £1,000,000. If the Irish Council Bill is carried this year he will have to diminish that diminished sum by £650,000. In other words, if the right hon. Gentleman's colleagues succeed in their projects of legislation, his £2,250,000 will be reduced to something a good deal less than a £1,000,000—a very small nucleus indeed for a scheme of old age pensions which is to cost £25,000,000 a year. And observe, the right hon. Gentleman filled a great deal of his speech by discussions as to the need of raising the national credit. But if by raising the national credit he means making permanent provision for paying off debt, that further permanent provision will have to be made at the cost of what remains of the £2,250,000. It will have to be made at the cost of the £600,000 or £700,000 which, if his projects of legislation are going to be successful, is all that he will have to pay either for the purpose of old age pensions or for the purpose of raising the national credit. And this leaves out of account altogether all the big schemes of social reform. It leaves out of account altogether the natural growth of expenditure, which no Chancellor of the Exchequer, with the best will in the world, has ever been able to resist, and which certainly the right hon. Gentleman shows no greater power of dealing with than any of his predecessors. That is the position on the present basis of taxation. And what is that basis of taxation? The basis of taxation is 1s. in the pound on income-tax, a very heavy duty on sugar, a very heavy duty on tea, and other taxes which I need not now dwell upon. Does anybody think that satisfactory? The Chancellor of the Exchequer does not. Does the hon. Member for Leicester, who spoke for the Labour Party? Does the hon. Member for North Paddington think it satisfactory? The hon. Member for Leicester got up, and, while he occasionally threw a faint compliment to the good intentions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, he filled all the earlier part of his speech with the most vigorous denunciations of the selfish character, or the anti-social character of the Budget, for which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was responsible. And what is the Member for North Paddington's view? He objects altogether to putting any tax upon a new article. That is his first proposition. His second proposition is that the expenditure of the country must be greatly increased. His third proposition is that you must take all the duty off tea; his fourth proposition is that you must take all the duty off sugar; and his fifth proposition is that you must get the enormous deficit by graduating the income-tax. That is practically the suggestion of the hon. Member for North Paddington for our future guidance; he acknowledges the accuracy of my summary of his very interesting speech.

Does he suggest that that is practical politics? Does he really think that any Chancellor of the Exchequer can come down and modify the Budget in that fashion? I doubt it. I believe that even in the serried ranks among which he is now sitting he would find no support for such a proposal, and everybody would recognise that his scheme, at all events, is one wholly impracticable. I do not know that the hon. Member for Leicester's scheme is much more easily carried out. His plan is, not to throw everything in a differentiated income-tax, but to try to get out of ground values, I think he said by simply appropriating them without compensation, all the money now required for carrying on the public service and initiating those great schemes of social reform with which, no doubt, all sympathise in every quarter of the House. Is that a practical system? Is that the kind of Budget the House is going to accept? We have three suggestions before us. We have that of the Member for North Paddington, that of the Member for Leicester, and the actual plan of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer does not defend his own plan. He does not say that 1s. income-tax is a good thing. He says it is a very bad thing. He does not say that the tax on sugar is good, nor does he wish to keep the tea duty at its present level. Yet he knows better than anybody that the claims which will be made upon him, and which he will not be able to answer on the present basis of taxation, are claims which are certain to come in and which it will not be possible for any Chancellor of the Exchequer now or hereafter to resist. When you survey the actual balance sheet of the country and the way of meeting expenditure, surely you must be driven to the conclusion that, in the words of the Amendment, the basis of taxation ought to be widened. There have been very curious misconceptions as to the meaning of the phrase "widening the basis of taxation." The present Minister for Education seems to think that, by widening the basis of taxation is meant the increasing of the number of people taxed; and precisely the same meaning was put upon it by the Member for Leicester. That is not the meaning which the framers of the Amendment attach to the phrase, and it is not the ordinary meaning which attaches to it. When you speak of widening the basis of taxation, you mean, not drawing more people into the net of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but drawing more articles for taxation into his net. Those are two quite different propositions. There seem to be some hon. Gentlemen opposite who do not appreciate that. I confess it seems to me rather elementary. But it is quite evident that you attack the same person either by extracting £10 from him in the way of income-tax, or £10 by a tax on sugar, or £10 by a tax on motor-cars. In each of these cases you put the same tax on the same person; but if you put a part of the income-tax, or a part of the sugar tax, or a part of the motor-car tax on him, you then have a more extended system of taxation, so far as it goes. Now I hope even the most anxious of my audience are clear as to the meaning of "widening the basis of taxation." That is the meaning in which it is used in the Amendment, that is the sense in which it has always been used, until this debate, in economic discussions. Now, Sir, we do not raise, nobody desires to raise, by this Amendment any question as to the incidence of taxation as between the different classes of the community. That may be just, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer supposes it, or it may be unjust, as the hon. Member for Leicester and the hon. Member for Paddington suppose it. We do not raise that question, though it is, no doubt, a most important question. We assume that the incidence of taxation is not in question. We only say that the taxation on the same people may be better raised than it is now. It is admitted that there are great and obvious evils in attempting to keep the income-tax at 1s. or in attempting to maintain a high rate of duty on tea, sugar, and tobacco; and if you can extend the subjects which you tax and not the individuals you tax we believe you will probably find a better system than you have now. But I believe you will be forced to extend them whether you like it or not, unless you are driven to some of those methods of dealing with a graduated income-tax and so forth which, in my judgment, would give you very little money and would enormously disturb the country's industries. If you are not going to do it by a graduated income-tax, this increased expenditure, which all admit will occur and may desire to occur, must be taken from other taxable articles. You cannot add materially to the income-tax or to the tea or sugar duties or to the spirit duties, and even if you could you would leave your system open to many objections, and certainly most inelastic in times of national stress and emergency. What we say is that the situation displayed by the Budget statement has the peculiarity of casting the view forward, far beyond the year in which the statement is made. We deduce from that that for our own purposes, without having any regard to the Colonies or foreign nations, without touching on the question of retaliation or preference, we ought to modify the existing system. That is the first conclusion I draw, and it is drawn from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement. My second conclusion is drawn from the views expressed by the Colonial Prime Ministers. I say that any taxation you put on for your own purposes should be used, as far as it can be, to meet the views of the Colonies, and I believe this system of taxation, to which you will be forced, whatever your views about preference, will prove to be useful, and can be used for the purpose of Colonial preference. Now, it will be seen that my suggested policy depends on the House accepting three propositions—one, that the present system is not sufficient for our needs; secondly, that any change in the system must be in the direction of extending the net of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and taxing fresh articles; and, thirdly, that when you have extended your system of taxable articles, you will be in possession of a fiscal system which can be used, to the immense advantage of the commerce and manufactures of the country and for the benefit and unity of the Empire, for the purpose of establishing Colonial preference. I have been attacked by the Prime Minister for enunciating these views while the Colonial Premiers were in this country. I have been told that this is turning the visit of the Prime Ministers to a political object. It is nothing of the kind. So far as my poor powers go, I have most sedulously avoided, in the presence of the Prime Ministers, saying one single word which would be capable of a Party interpretation. But is my mouth to be shut on these questions simply because the eminent statesmen who are now our guests happen to be in the country? Are we to draw no moral and no conclusions from what they say? Are we to be blind and deaf to all their utterances? That seems to me to be a counsel, not only not of perfection, but of the utmost imperfection; and having to address my fellow-countrymen, I certainly think I should have been wanting in my duty if I had not at once pointed out what I considered is the new practical situation brought upon us in reference to this great question by the double fact of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Budget and the reiterated and re-expressed wishes of the Colonial Prime Ministers. Some hon. Gentlemen have told us that this attempt to make arrangements with our Colonies will be in the nature of bargains which turn friends into enemies, and which do not bind closer the bonds which already unite friends. I cannot understand that reasoning. I notice that yesterday Mr. Deakin himself said that unity was his great object. The methods by which that unity is to be arrived at are relatively unimportant. Unity ought to be our great object. Are we seriously to be told that unity is not enhanced because you happen to come to arrangements about which it is possible to have controversy? I do not know where any human relations would be if these principles were to be accepted. Matrimony would vanish at once. Of course all close relations give possible material for controversy. Nobody doubts it; but without close relationship you cannot have unity. The ideal of hon. Gentlemen opposite is to have our interests so separate that it is impossible to conceive of any difficulty arising between us because there is nothing about which we can conceivably quarrel. That is not an ideal of the relationship which ought to exist between human beings, between the Mother Country and the Colonies, or I would even say, between separate States. Dangers there are, dangers there must be, in any course which we decide to pursue; but surely we feel our fate too much, or our deserts are small, if we cannot trust ourselves to meet wishes expressed, not once, not twice, not casually, but officially; not by this man or that man, but by the authorised representatives of these great self-governing communities—if we cannot trust ourselves to try to come to some arrangement with them which will be so enormously for the benefit, as I think, of the commerce of both the Mother Country and the Colonies, and which would make us feel from day to day that we were something more than citizens even, living under the same flag and owning allegiance to the same Sovereign, but that we were people with common interests present to our minds from day to day. I do think that we have now a situation in this country which we should be criminal if we neglected. I perfectly understand that. I never agreed with those of my friends who have thought that our existing system of taxation is so satisfactory that even for these great objects it would be folly to disturb it. I have never agreed to that. But now that it is admitted that our existing system is not satisfactory, and that even those who are going to support the Government are telling the Government that their Budget is based on intolerable principles; now that the Government themselves admit that they have to keep all these duties at an inexpedient level to meet the expenditure which they foresee, and have nothing whatever in hand to meet expenditure which they do not foresee; now that we have the Government committing themselves, as they say, to a scheme of old age pensions and making no provision for it except the beggarly residue which is to remain of this £2,250,000—in that situation surely we have the right to say that an adhesion to the system of the past is really an outworn policy, that adhesion to the past is a thing that cannot go on, that something new must be devised, some new plan invented. When that plan is devised and invented, the least we can do, the smallest tribute we can pay to the warm-hearted wishes of those who only desire closer union with us, will be to give some consideration to their reiterated demands for closer commercial union.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I trust I shall not be thought wanting in respect to the many admirable speeches which have been made on both sides of the House in the course of this debate if I venture to say that its practical interest, in the stage which this controversy has now reached, is narrowed down to a single point—namely, whether or not the Party who sit opposite are at last definitely, and as a Party, committed to protection. The Amendment which we are ostensibly discussing is drawn like so many of its predecessors—and it is quite worthy to take a place in the long series of official, or *quasi*-official, declarations of fiscal policy which have proceeded from those right hon Gentlemen during the last four years—it is so drawn that, according to the mind or the taste of the person who reads it, it can be construed to mean anything in the world, or nothing at all. The views of the right hon. Gentleman who moved it yesterday, although they were not ostentatiously obtruded in the speech which he delivered, are perfectly well known, and to do him justice they have never been concealed. But, though I am afraid the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down will accuse me either of a deficiency in common intelligence or of a want of care and attention in reading his public utterances, and I would plead guilty to the first much sooner than to the second, I say that the state of his opinions was, until he rose just now, and I venture to say remains now that he has sat down, one of the most interesting and at the same time one of the most baffling psychological problems that have ever been known. The right hon. Gentleman tells us to-day, not for the first time, that he is not a protectionist. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Hear, hear."] That was very faint applause. He is not protectionist; yet let me console those Gentlemen who were silent just now; although not protectionist, no one has ever shown himself more sensitive, or I think I may say more copiously alive, to the infinite imperfections of what we call free trade. The right hon. Gentleman, in fact, has succeeded in a feat which to any one of less intellectual dexterity than himself I should have thought impossible, the feat at one and the same time, without apparently any sense either of logical or dialectical incongruity, of repudiating protection and denouncing free trade. I, like so many of my friends, may not be endowed with those special interpretative faculties which are necessary for the purpose of piercing the true and inner meaning of the right hon. Gentleman's declarations, but I am as much in the dark at this moment as I have ever been as to what is the definite and specific policy he proposes to this House. The right hon. Gentleman tells us he has not changed his opinions; well, I daresay he has not. He tells us that he has long thought and often said that matters have changed so much in the tariff system of the world since the days of Sir Robert Peel that the argument for free trade which was then, or might have been, presented as a thoroughly sound argument is no longer valid. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Free imports."] Well, what I call free trade and shall continue to call free trade. The right hon. Gentleman must forgive me for saying that he is entirely wrong. In the first place, in point of fact—I am speaking now from memory, but I am pretty sure I am accurate—the tariff walls which British trade had to surmount in the time of Sir Robert Peel were higher than any corresponding walls they have to surmount to-day. And in the second place, so far from Sir Robert Peel, or any intelligent supporter of Sir Robert Peel, thinking that his advocacy of free trade was in any way dependent upon the breaking down of those tariff walls, he expressly, in advance, repudiated more than once any such view. This is a false view of history which is so current that I will not apologise to the House for troubling them with two or three quotations from Sir Robert Peel himself, short and very much to the point. In 1846 he said—

> "In making this great reduction on the import of articles from foreign countries, I have no guarantee to give you that other countries will immediately follow our example."

[Interruption.] Yes, but let the hon. Member wait. Late in the same year, on resigning office, Sir Robert Peel said—

> "I trust that the new Government will not resume the policy which they and we found so inconvenient—namely, haggling with foreign countries instead of taking that independent course which we believe to be conducive to our own interests."

Three years later, when experience had already shown that foreign countries were not going, to any considerable extent at any rate, to relax their tariff system, speaking in this House on 6th July, 1849, he used these memorable words—

> "I maintain that the best way to compete with hostile tariffs is to encourage free imports."

That was the doctrine of Sir Robert Peel, and it has been the doctrine of every free-trader who understood the meaning of free trade.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR dissented, and mentioned the French Treaty.

MR. ASQUITH: I think I can demonstrate to the right hon. Gentleman that the French Treaty and everything connected with it was a policy perfectly consistent with that. So much for that point. The right hon. Gentleman has also told us that he is in favour now, as he always has been, of Colonial preference; but what does he mean by Colonial preference? That is what he has never told us. Colonial preference clearly does one thing which, in his view of free trade, in his comparatively modest view of free trade, it ought not to do, it diverts the natural course of trade.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR dissented.

MR. ASQUITH: What good, then, is it going to do?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was understood to say that the course of trade was not natural, that it was diverted by duties, and that he wished to get it nearer the natural channel.

MR. ASQUITH: That explanation, I think, may be left to speak for itself. If hon. Gentlemen like, I will pursue the subject. I said that unquestionably it would divert the course of trade, and the whole object of it is that it should. In other words, instead of getting, as we do now, our supply from every available source in the world, the foreigner would be penalised as compared with the Colonial producer, and therefore the natural course of trade would be turned into another channel. I do not know any other meaning that can be attached to it. But the right hon. Gentleman added that we ought not to be too pedantic, that even if there was a small protective element in these preferential duties we might regard it as the first step, at any rate, towards free trade within the Empire. That brings me to an argument used, I think, by my right hon. friend the Member for St. George's last night, quoting the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, who had expressed pleasure at the conclusion of preferential arrangements as between the different Colonies themselves. When two Colonies which are protective countries enter into a preferential arrangement the one with the other, that undoubtedly is a step, slight, may be, but still a step, in the direction of freer trade. Of course, a free trade country like this would not withhold its pleasure from such an arrangement. But when you ask us to come in, exactly the contrary takes place; instead of taking down a stone or two from the walls which already exist, if we enter into this preferential arrangement with them we are to build up for the first time as against the foreigner a wall which has no existence at all. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that two new factors have recently come into view which have had a great influence, at any rate in his mind—the Budget and the Colonial Conference. As regards the Budget, I wish I could think that it was so startling in its originality that it could have produced the same effect on the mind of the right hon. Gentleman as I think the reading of Hume produced on the mind of Kant, and have awakened him from what I would call his undogmatic slumber. But I cannot claim for it any such title, anxious as I am in my parental solicitude to magnify its importance in every possible way. I commended the proposals of the Budget to the House, and still commend them, not merely on their own merits, but because I believe they open and clear the way to larger and better things in the near future. But the Budget involves no departure in point of principle from preceding Budgets, and yet I observe it is treated by the right hon. Gentleman and his colleagues as though it were in some way or other a practical confession for the first time that our fiscal system—free trade—has broken down, or is on the point of breaking down. I cannot understand that argument at all. I said the exact contrary. In my Budget speech I never said that we had reached, and I do not believe that we have reached, the limit, or anything like the limit, of our possible taxation. And when I spoke of setting aside a modest nucleus of some £2,250,000 or £2,500,000, I never said that that was the whole sum we hoped to have available. I am not to be tempted into giving a forecast of what next year's Budget will be; but I said that we should start with so much to the good, and that is something gained. It is said that we can only produce this revenue by a system of bad taxes; but all taxes are bad—it is only a question of degree. The exact effect of the income-tax at 1s. in the pound will be this. If you take into account the number of persons who benefit by the existing scales of abatement, and those who will benefit by the 3d. differential rate of computation, you will find that out of an estimated total of 1,025,000 income-tax payers some 920,000 will pay less than the 1s. in the pound. If you aggregate the amount of income assessed to income-tax before deductions and abatements at £770,000,000, and the estimated yield at £31,250,000, the average rate per pound that will be paid on the yield will not be more than 9¾d. in the pound. So that I am giving relief to 920,000 income-tax payers, and the average rate will not be more than 9¾d. in the pound. I now come to the proposition that we should broaden our basis of taxation. I assert that, in any intelligible sense of the word, the basis of taxation in this country is as broad as, and I believe it to be broader than that of any other country in the world. It consists, first of all, of taxes upon necessaries, next, of taxes upon the simpler luxuries and alcoholic drinks and tobacco, and finally, of taxes upon income and property. You cannot make a system of taxation very much broader than that, and the confusion of thought consists in confounding the number of persons and interests over whom taxation is spread with the multiplicity in the number and variety of things in regard to which taxes are levied. We have had practical experience of what the right hon. Gentleman calls broadening the basis of taxation in the past in this country. Sir Robert Peel found a tariff covering a very large number of commodities. What was the result of practical experience upon that broad basis? The result was it hampered all trade, it encouraged evasion, produced incalculable friction and constant intriguing on the part of competitive interests, and a large and unnecessary rise of price to the consumer, and, finally, an inelastic revenue to the State. It was abandoned, not in deference to any dogma or theory of free trade, but because in practical experience it was found to be injurious to the country. Then we had the experiment made a few years ago by Sir Michael Hicks Beach. What has become of that? Sir Michael Hicks Beach was a free-trader, and I doubt whether he would have tried that experiment at all if he had not been in urgent need of revenue for the purpose of the war. Finding himself in need of war capital, he divided his war taxes into two categories—temporary and permanent. The permanent taxes were the corn tax, the coal tax, and the sugar tax. What has been their history? The corn tax lived precisely twelve months, when it was repealed by the very Cabinet who had levied it. The coal duty suffered its death blow at my hands last year; but whatever Government had been in power—Liberal or Conservative, free trade or protectionist—that coal tax could not possibly have survived for more than another year. I remember very well that in the stress, or I might say the agony, of the general election the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham made a declaration of great interest to the mining industry, that if the late Government had remained in power this tax would have been abolished. The only tax that remains then is the sugar duty, and there is a consensus of opinion in all quarters of the House that it should be diminished, or, as I think, when the time arrives, entirely removed. So that I venture to say, whether in the remote past or in the recent past, attempts to broaden the basis of taxation have not had a happy experience and should not be repeated. Then as to the statement that new light had been thrown on the matter by the Colonial Conference, I fail to see where the novelty comes in. Everybody knew before the Colonial Premiers came here that the self-governing Colonies had either put into operation, or else offered to do so, preferential tariffs in favour of British trade. These tariffs vary very much in their nature and value. The Canadian and the South African tariffs are relatively wide in their scope and substantial in the preferences they give. The New Zealand tariff affects only 20 per cent. of our imports into that Colony. The Australian tariff has never yet come into operation, because the Bill had to be reserved. Let me say here that I quite agree with what Mr. Deakin said at the Conference that it was intended to be but a forerunner, and therefore it would not be fair to take it as representing the final form the Australian offer may ultimately take. But this Australian tariff will apply to only 8 per cent. of the total importation of the United Kingdom produce into Australia, and it will only apply then if we accept a condition, which I do not believe the people of this country will ever accept, namely, that these goods shall be carried only in British ships manned only by white labour. Everybody knew that these tariffs existed, and everybody knew also that all these tariffs are so contrived that under them British manufacturers have no chance of any sort of competing on level terms in the Colonial markets with native producers. I do not complain of that; I said so at the Conference. On the contrary, I said—

> "We have given you fiscal autonomy, and we should be madmen if we attempted to interfere with your full exercise of it. You are just as much entitled as we are to freedom in fiscal ideas."

We have no right to complain, and they would be acting like fools—flying in the teeth of the very economic system they have adopted—if they let us, the most enterprising manufacturing nation in the world, undermine their native industries. Everybody knew all that before the Premiers arrived. Everybody knew, too, that the electors of the United Kingdom had by an unexampled majority, after a controversy prolonged for three years, in which every aspect of the matter had been exhaustively reviewed in every town and in every hamlet—[OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh," and MINISTERIAL cheers]—the electors of this country had by that unexampled majority declared that they were not going to change our fiscal system or abandon free trade. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh," and renewed MINISTERIAL cheers.] Therefore, I do not understand what is the new fact which has been brought home to the right hon. Gentleman by the Colonial Conference, and which was not common knowledge before any Premier left his own shore. But we sat for five days discussing these matters in the frankest and fullest fashion. They spoke very plainly to us and we spoke very plainly to them. I am quite certain that, notwithstanding the mischievous and unscrupulous activity of the baser section of the protectionist Press, who have shrunk from no kind of imagination and of innuendo for the purpose of creating bad blood between the Mother Country and the Colonies in the hope that, peradventure, they might in that way manufacture a little dirty political capital—I say again what is absolutely free from doubt, and I am sure every one of my friends, for so I will call the Colonial Premiers, will agree with me, that after this full and frank and candid, but at the same time most cordial, interchange of opinion, although we agreed to differ, we rose from that table better friends than when we sat down. That is the only new fact, so far as I know, that has come into view. I come now to the practical conclusion of the whole matter. What is it that you want us to do? What is it you want the House of Commons to affirm? Surely not the principle that was put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's last night, which I think was given only some faint countenance by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, that we should give the Colonies a preference on our existing duties. What possible good would that do to the Colonies? To some of them it would make no difference of any sort or kind; to none of them would it be any appreciable material advantage. We hear about Cape wine. I am speaking from memory, but I think the exports of Cape wine to this country are valued at £8,000 a year. I hope it will grow very much; it was once much larger than it is now. But it is now only £8,000. This proposal would only affect a little part of South Africa. What about the sheep farmers and other persons engaged in agricultural pursuits throughout South Africa, who would obtain no advantage of any sort or kind from our tampering with the wine duty? It is a very good object lesson as to the way these things are apt to work out. For the sake of giving a preference to this small industry we are to revise our wine scale and impose differential duties against France and Germany, and possibly—I am not sufficiently informed as to the alcholic strength of the wines of Spain—against Spain and Portugal also. The thing is not worth thinking about; everybody knows it is not. It is all very well to say it cannot do very much harm even if it does not do very much good. At any rate, it concedes the whole principle. When you have once granted preference in regard to existing duties, you have no longer an answer to the demand for that other from of preference which consists of the imposition of new duties. I venture to say that you are asking for something which is of no value to you but which to us would involve the sacrifice of the whole of those principles in which we believe. Only one thing remains. As I have said over and over again, I am sorry to have to repeat it, it may be for the thousandth time—and this is where I complain of the right hon. Gentleman, for he will not bring his mind to the concrete facts of the case—you cannot give an effective or even an approximately just preference to the Colonies unless you impose discriminating duties against foreign food and foreign raw material. There is no way under Heaven by which the thing can be done except by adopting one, and I will say both, of those two expedients. And this Amendment to the Bill which has been moved from that Bench, although we have not heard a single right hon. Gentleman who has ventured to adopt that construction of it, is open to no other construction in the mind of any intelligent man. If this Amendment were carried the Colonial Premiers could go home and say, "The House of Commons has in effect conceded everything we went to England to ask for." Therefore the sum and substancce of the whole matter is that under the guise of this Amendment—although the right hon. Gentleman who supported it was very gingerly in coming to close quarters with its practical application—the House is being asked to-night to reverse the verdict that was given by the country at the last general election, to be false to the pledges which the vast majority of us gave to our constituents, and to take steps towards undermining the free trade system of this country.

*MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman, when he accused a section of the Press of attempting to create bad blood between the Mother Country and the Colonies, had forgotten the action of his own Party at the time of the general election in regard to Chinese labour and the alleged slavery in regard to it. He thought it was a pity that he did not address to his own friends the little lecture he had given to the Opposition that evening. The right hon. Gentleman had said that there was nothing new about this question of Colonial favour or preference, and that everybody knew that the Colonies had either given us a preference or had made us the offer to do so. If everybody knew that why had every speaker on the other side gone about the country saying that there had been no offer? In this debate, moreover, nearly every speaker on the other side and certainly the official speakers had tried to shift the onus of drawing up an alternative Budget on to the Opposition, but he thought the justification for the Amendment lay in the fact that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had introduced into his Budget this year a new principle. This was a Budget, they were told, not for one year but for several years, and in order to buy off opposition to it the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a very vague and indefinite offer about old age pensions. That promise, if it was to be fulfilled, could only be fulfilled by some increase of taxation, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to redeem his promises in regard to future years he should provide the means of carrying them out, and when he made such promises he should say how he intended to carry them out on our present basis of taxation. He challenged the right hon. Gentleman to say how he intended to carry out his promise with regard to old age pensions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that next year there would be two and a half or two and three-quarter millions for old age pensions, but it had been pointed out to him that some £650,000 would be due to Ireland and £150,000 to Jamaica. They were also told that there were going to be subsidies given to the shipping lines to the Colonies, and the right hon. Gentleman seemed to have entirely left out of account the automatic increase of the Civil Service, an increase which this year had amounted to £650,000. That left very little indeed for a nucleus for a scheme of old age pensions next year, and it all depended upon the right hon. Gentleman having as prosperous a year as he expected whether he would be able to carry out his promise. That, however, was a matter of some question. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be right in his forecast. If hon. Members opposite came down like the President of the Board of Education had done and said that the one idea of himself and his Party was to relieve the poor and to take off taxation from the shoulders of those who felt it most, he would like to know why neither in this year's Budget nor in last year's Budget any effort had been made in the direction of relieving those who felt most the burden of taxation. True it was that last year a 1d. was taken off the tea duty, but they were told this year that that was no use, and that unless they reduced the tea duty by 2d. the money went into the pocket of the tea dealer. If that was so, the 1d. remission of last year was useless and nothing had been done this year. Therefore he did not think it lay in the mouths of hon. Members opposite to talk about relieving those who were the most heavily taxed portion of the community. Several strong speeches had been made in which was repeated the old maxim that if they were going to make a reduction in direct taxation it ought to be accompanied by some concurrent reduction in indirect taxation. The indirect taxpayers had not, however, had any relief, and he did not see the slightest chance of their getting it unless they had from those who were responsible for the finance of the country some new form of Budget. They had had suggestions from various parts of the House as to objects for which additional funds were required, but there had not been from any responsible person a single suggestion as to how those objects were to be carried out. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that some day he was going to take off the sugar duty if it was possible to do so, but had not said how it was to be done. There were a good many Members of the House who would like to see more money spent on education, especially in regard to providing for secondary education out of the taxation of the country. Last year the zeal of His Majesty's Government was so great that they said that this year they were prepared to spend £1,000,000 under what they called an Education Bill. Now that education was separated from the process of destroying religious teaching in the schools, not one penny could be found for education. What was proposed in this Budget would stand for all time in front of any chance education might have in the future. Again, people could only be brought back to the land, and those who were now there kept there, with the assistance of public money. By the suggestion that local taxation grants would not increase but probably diminish, the £3,000,000, which, according to the report of the Local Taxation Committee, ought to come out of the public purse in order to adjust the unfair burden of local taxation, would be prevented from reaching the pockets of those who ought to be relieved. Therefore he failed to see what possible opportunity they would have of carrying out a feasible scheme of bringing the people back to the land if they were to be constantly told there was no money to be had from the Exchequer and that everything had been promised for old age pensions. Whether the right hon. Gentleman was going to adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for Leicester, who said that our system of taxation ought to be that of a pyramid standing on its apex, or that of the hon. Member for North Paddington, who proposed to get over the whole difficulty by a largely graduated income-tax, or whether he inclined to the idea that the only method of securing reforms that all required was by dropping a battleship, or so many regiments, each year off the estimates, the country ought to be told how he proposed to carry out his scheme. If the right hon. Gentleman proposed to budget in advance he surely ought to say what he intended to do to find the money.

*Mr. MOND (Chester) said he desired at the outset to apologise to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's division. When he interrupted the right hon. Gentleman, as he thought at the right hon. Gentleman's desire, and said he thought it was fortunate that the right hon. Gentleman was not in business, he did not wish in any way to reflect upon his mental capacity, but only to imply, when the right hon. Gentleman challenged business men to deny a proposition that he made, that though the right hon. Gentleman might be an eminent statesman, he would be a very poor man of business. The House had listened to a most eloquent, inspiring, and oratorical speech from the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. He had listened to that speech with great interest and delight and had sympathised very much with the right hon. Gentleman in one way. He had been unfortunately misunderstood with regard to fiscal policy not only on the Government, but on the Opposition side of the House. He had never seen himself that the right hon. Gentleman had changed his views from the moment he began to explain them. The right hon. Gentleman was a philosopher and an economist. He saw the evils or the wants of free trade and the heresies of protection, and walked gingerly between the two in a manner which satisfied neither his friends nor his opponents. That was a characteristic of the right hon. Gentleman. He remembered speaking to one of the electors of Manchester shortly after the last election and that gentleman said of their late representative that if he had been a good free trader they might have got him in, and if he had been a good protectionist they might have got him in; but the people of Manchester would not vote for a metaphysical abstraction. He felt for the right hon. Gentleman, because he himself had taken an interest in metaphysics, but he hoped that in time the right hon. Gentleman would convince and convert his right hon. friend the Member for East Worcestershire, who was now leading the tariff reform party, that there was no occasion for the valentine letters, which, according to the right hon. Gentleman, need never have been written; that the Party opposite were quite a happy family if he would only give up repeating economic views which nobody could follow. He was grateful not to hear from him that the foreigner was going to pay the tax, and that the policy of the Tariff Reform League, with all its speeches, pamphlets, letters, and machinery, was never adopted by the right hon. Gentleman; that he was a good free trader at heart to-day; and that it was only with the soft hand that he inflicted wounds on her he loved to assuage the anger of the ravening wolf of tariff reform. He, however, quarrelled very seriously with the right hon. Gentleman's definition of free trade. A free trader believed that it was not the function of the State, by means of tariffs or duties on imports, to interfere with the industries of the country. A protectionist believed that it was the function of the State to do so, and to develop the interests of some industries at the expense of others. That was a good definition of the two principles, though he did not deny that much might be said in favour of both policies. He had read a most interesting book by a German protectionist who, however, did not say the foreigner was going to pay the tax. That gentleman said Germany must protect her agriculture because they wanted to keep the people on the soil and wanted soldiers; that they must decrease the imports of manufactured goods because they were parasites on the industry of the country. That was a logical argument which they could follow; but here there was the same kind of argument used again and again about the foreigner paying the tax, providing revenue while excluding foreign goods, and it was all to be done by the same duty. So long as they went on one duty they could not do it. If they really believed in stopping the imports of manufactured goods, why did not they advocate the passing of a short Act prohibiting their importation? Why should they follow the hideous traditions of other countries? Let them look at what happened in America. The right hon. Gentleman was not a protectionist, and never was, nor was America protectionist. The first American tariff was put on for revenue purposes simply at the time of the American war. But when the war came to an end the manufacturers who had grown rich under the tariff remained and the tariff was revised; all the protectionist portions of it were extended and the revenue parts of it were diminished. Ever since then there had been a continual see-saw, sometimes there was a high tax on pig iron and a low tax on wool, some times a high tax on wool and a low tax on pig iron. £30,000,000 the American steel trust drew from the American people every year because of the American tariff. He made a serious appeal to hon. Members opposite. He asked them to read the history of the American, or any other tariff, and to read of "Pig Iron Kelly" and others who had built up those tariffs, and then say whether they wanted to repeat that sort of thing in the House of Commons; whether they wished to come there to represent the interests of the British nation, or that of pig iron or some other industry. Hon. Members opposite said that such things would not occur in this country; but that had been said by every one of these people, all of whom had been dragged down into the pit. And as those people had been dragged down, so should they all, if protection once came into that House. It was irresistible. They should come to that House session after session, and discuss high and low tariffs and duties, or no duty, on wool, and matters of that kind. Let them go to Germany, and see how the agricultural party raised the price of agricultural produce, with the result that the people were starved because of the bargains made in the lobbies—"Vote for a higher duty on iron and we will vote for a higher duty on corn." We were pure in our politics in this country in a way they were not pure in any other country in the world, but if protection was once again introduced the same jobbery would go on here that went on in America. One of the leading statesmen of Australia, Senator Edward Pulsford, said—

> "If supporters of preference in the United Kingdom could but know how they have strengthened the barriers that exclude British goods in Australia, and probably throughout the world they would feel both sorry and ashamed."

That was from one of the leading and responsible statesmen of Australia. All that the tariff reformers were doing, in advocating preference with the best motives, was to encourage the protectionists of Australia to help to exclude those goods which they wished to see admitted. In that House they might discuss this subject in a more or less statesmanlike way. But let them go out to the public platforms, during any by-election, and what did the issue come to? There was only one issue that the people would listen to, and that was free trade or protection. Before that issue all the beautiful shades of meaning of the Leader of the Opposition disappeared. For the people there was only the brutal and naked fact which they fought against years ago, and which they would fight and defeat again. He had taken the trouble to get together some figures with regard to this matter in reply to the argument of hon. Gentlemen opposite that the exports to our Colonies had increased much more largely than to foreign countries. That statement was a mistake. The export of manufactured goods to agricultural and non-agricultural countries had increased more rapidly than the exports of manufactured goods to self-manufacturing countries. That was pretty obvious. He had taken 1898 and 1905; there was no trick about the years he had chosen. In the period from 1898 to 1905, the exports to the Argentine Republic had grown by £7,571,065; to Canada by £6,592,259; to Australia by £530,218; to New Zealand, by £2,529,180; and to India by £13,998,219. Those were our total exports. He never made fancy distinctions between manufactured articles and other things; our business was to sell what people wanted to buy and to receive the money for them. The man who worked in the mine, who produced iron ore, or coal, did not pause to consider whether the article was highly finished; he was content if he got his money on the Saturday. The figures which he had quoted showed an increase of our exports of 120 per cent. in the case of the Argentine; 90 per cent. Canada; 3 per cent. Australia; 50 per cent. New Zealand and 80 per cent. India. We had £300,000,000 worth of capital in the Argentine which was really an English Colony in all except nationality. Were the tariff reformers going to interfere with that? Let them take Germany. To that country from 1898 to 1905, we had increased our exports by over £9,410,599—as much as the whole of the self-governing Colonies put together; to Italy by £3,502,341; and to Japan by £4,734,750. Where did they find the confirmation of the wonderful statement that our exports to foreign countries were diminishing year by year? He wished some of the gentlemen who made such statements would look into the figures, or go to the big houses in Manchester, Liverpool, and London, and ask the merchants whether they found their statements to be the fact. Our exports to Germany had increased in the period stated by 25 per cent.; to Italy by 50 per cent.; and to Japan by 90 per cent. We were not only holding our own, but were gaining every day. To enable us to continue gaining, he would say to hon. Gentlemen opposite, "For goodness' sake leave us untouched." As a man responsible to many thousands of shareholders, for many million pounds' worth of capital, and for the welfare of many thousands of English workmen, he begged hon. Members opposite not to shackle their hands and feet by trying to assist them in their industry. If they tried to assist them they would make a complete and hopeless mess of it. Let them settle this as business men. If they interfered with commerce they would do much more harm than good. He wished to quote a few words about Colonial preference or Imperial reciprocity—

> "This proposal requires that we should abandon our system in favour of theirs, and it is in effect that while the Colonies should be left absolutely free to impose what protective duties they please, both upon foreign imports and upon British commerce, they should be required to make a small discrimination in favour of British trade, in return for which we are expected to change our whole system, and impose duties on food and raw material. Well, I express again my own opinion, when I say that there is not the slightest chance that in any reasonable time this country, or the Parliament of this country, would adopt so one-sided an agreement. The foreign trade of this country is so large and the Colonial trade so small, that a small preference given to us upon that foreign trade by the Colonies would make so trifling a difference."

Those were the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, speaking at the Canada Club in 1896. On many other occasions the right hon. Gentleman had spoken with great force and vigour and truth, and he regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had not maintained the sound opinion which he then expressed. Again, speaking at Manchester in 1897, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham said—

> "Anything in the direction of an Imperial Commercial League would weaken the Empire internally and excite the permanent hostility of the whole world. It would check the free import of the food of the people. It is impracticable, but if it were practicable and done in the name of Empire, it would make the Empire odious to the working people, it would combine the world against us, we would be a cause of imitation."

He asked the House to realise what those words meant. Somebody would tell the millions outside that Empire meant dear bread and dear meat, and did they think that would endear the Empire to the masses? As one who loved the Empire, he wanted to see it democratically upheld; and he protested, and would continue to protest, against the odious idea of putting into the minds of the democracy the idea that the Empire must necessarily mean dear food. A celebrated British statesman said—

> "It may be that I shall leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of good-will in those places which are the abode of men whose lot it is to labour and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow—a name remembered with expressions of good will when they shall re-create their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because it is no longer leavened with a sense of injustice."

Those were the words of Sir Robert Peel in the last speech he delivered in 1846. Statues of Sir Robert Peel stood in the country with the inscription, "He gave us free bread." Did the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire wish to be remembered by statues with the inscription, "He taxed the children's bread?" If ever the Opposition were returned to power as tariff reformers he assured them that they would be fought by the free traders like Cobden and Bright fought them in the most gloomy days, and they would go on fighting until this corpse of protection was buried again. It was no use dressing up the old skeleton in preference clothes, or hanging on it the totems of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, because it was still the old corpse of the corn tax which had been dug up again, the stench of which made the people of this country ill, and which, if the hon. Gentleman opposite ever wished to return to power, they had best reinter at the earliest possible opportunity.

*MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said he gathered that the hon. Member for Chester, who had just spoken, was opposed to the Amendment, and he wished to examine for a moment or two the reasons which had been put forward why the Amendment should not be accepted. The reason put forward by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the hon. Member for Leicester was that this was a *chose jugée*. The answer to that contention was in the speech of the hon. Member for Chester. Fiscal reform was, he said, the one question which interested the people and upon which they still had an open mind. It was, he said, a question upon which they wanted to have their minds made up. In the second place tariff reformers were told that the people of this country would never buy social reform or old age pensions at the price of a tax upon food. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Hear, hear."] He wished to point out that the Government now proposed to sell it at the price of taxation on food. [MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh."] Was sugar not a food? Upon that point the Chancellor of the Exchequer was much wiser than some of his followers, because with his great dialectical skill he foresaw that objection and said that his reason for the retention of the sugar tax was that it was a war tax and no war tax ought to be abolished until the war indebtedness had been discharged. That was an ingenious, but unsound argument. Was the House aware that at that moment they were paying for the war indebtedness of the Crimean War and the French Wars? He did not suppose the right hon. Gentleman's enthusiasm as a financial purist would carry him so far as to propose to return to the war taxation of those periods. Had hon. Members opposite ever thought how duties on sugar and corn were felt in practice? A duty of 2s. per quarter on corn had been suggested. If such a duty were imposed it would be placed upon foreign corn, and Colonial corn would still continue to come in on the same terms. That would be a duty which would be not universal but only partial in its application. However, he would concede for argument's sake that the whole of such a tax would be paid by the consumers in this country. What would it amount to? A duty of 2s. upon corn represented something like 7 per cent. upon the value of the article, whilst the duty upon sugar represented 35 per cent. He would for a moment consider the figures in regard to consumption. Roughly speaking, for the last ten years the people of this country consumed on an average six bushels of corn per head of the population. A 2s. tax on corn upon six bushels amounted to 1s. 6d. per head per annum. The average consumption of sugar in this country was something like 85 lbs. per head of the population. Last year the average was over 87 lbs., but he would for the purposes of his argument place it at 80 lbs. That would amount at a halfpenny per pound not to 1s. 6d. but to 3s. 4d. per head. There was a further question which arose out of this. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not reduce the duty on sugar by half because the consumer would not get the benefit, and if the sugar duty meant a burden of 3s. 4d. per head of the population, how was it if they were going to take off half of the sugar duty, which was 1s. 8d. per head of the population, that that was going to be of no use to the consumer, while in the view of hon. Gentlemen opposite the consumer would be so vitally affected by a duty on corn when the taxation would only amount to about 1s. 6d. per head of the population? The second contention he wished to deal with was the statement of the old doctrine that taxation ought to be levied only for revenue purposes. That article of the free trade creed was now renounced by the Free Trade Party. They had heard a good deal about the taxation of ground values, and everybody knew that a scheme of that kind was in the air, somewhere between heaven and earth. Personally he had had some experience upon a Committee of inquiry into the question of ground values during the last year. The Committee of which he was a member, and also a previous Royal Commission, had reported that taxation of ground values could not be recommended because it would provide any very large hitherto untaxed source of revenue, but it was recommended because the majority of the Committee considered that it was likely to make some change in existing social conditions. That was imposing taxation not for revenue purposes, but for social purposes, and that was also the result of the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Leicester. Therefore the doctrine of taxation for revenue purposes only had gone by the board, and it was very doubtful whether it was ever seriously entertained by the Free Trade Party. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had spoken about Mr. Pitt as the father of income-tax, but exactly between Mr. Pitt's first speech on the income-tax and the time the right hon. Gentleman spoke, Lord Beaconsfield in the autumn of 1852 proposed a scheme of differentiation between earned and unearned incomes, which was almost precisely the same as that now proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That proposal was denounced by Mr. Gladstone and his Party, and the Government was thrown out of office on the introduction of that very scheme. When the President of the Board of Education said that differentiation of the income-tax was not likely to cripple its expansive power, he was going contrary not only to the belief of Mr. Gladstone, but to opinions which Mr. Gladstone succeeded in inculcating into a Cabinet. The doctrine of taxation for revenue purposes was not necessarily one which was adhered to by the Free Trade Party. Mr. Gladstone upon one celebrated occasion, in a Memorandum, alluded to in that life of Mr. Gladstone which was written by the Secretary of State for India,† recalled the fact that in 1843 he made strong speeches in favour of the extension of the system of colonial preference from Canada to the other Colonies of the Empire. He had one of Mr. Gladstone's speeches on that question in which he referred to the question of the extension of a preferential duty on corn between Canada and this country, and he said—

> "he believed that the exportation from Canada to England would give a great stimulus to the agriculture of the Colonies and be beneficial to the trade of both countries. At the same time it could not exert any injurious effect upon the productive industry of the English agriculturists. That was the kind of trade, independent of foreign countries, and mutually beneficial to two parts of the same Empire which could not be affected by hostile tariffs, which it was the duty of Parliament to encourage more than any other trade."

He commended that quotation to some hon. Members who admired Mr. Gladstone's principles so much but did not always follow in his footsteps. For that was the argument which was stated now by fiscal reformers. If they were going to raise the necessary revenue, they could not do it by confiscation pure and simple, and if they adhered to the present limited basis of taxation, then every day our system of taxation approximated more and more nearly to confiscation. If they were going to raise the necessary taxation fairly, it could be done only by broadening the basis of taxation. He did not ask the House to take that from himself. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies in 1902, speaking on the problem of unemployment in this country, said that—

> "The only chance for the struggling millions of whom they read in Mr. Rowntree's book, if ever they were to enjoy the bounties of nature, lay not in any socialistic system of taxation, not in any charitable enterprise, or charitable immunity from taxation, but solely and simply in effective scientific commercial development."

He commended that opinion to hon. Members opposite. If they really believed that in the name of free trade they could resist the object which this Amendment put forward, and if they really held that taxation was never to be laid on with the view, or indeed with the possibility, of benefiting British industry and furthering British commerce—if that was their conception of free trade, and if, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, free trade was to them the breath of life, all he could say was that the sooner they gave up the ghost the better.

---

† Morley's "Life of Gladstone," vol. i., p. 255.

MR. RENDALL (Gloucestershire, Thornbury) said the last speaker had quoted the opinions of certain well-known men. He and his friends were not concerned to defend the opinions which were held and expressed at a time when the speakers had not advanced to that position of intellectual development which they afterwards achieved. The scientific and commercial development to which the Under-Secretary for the Colonies referred in the passage quoted by the hon. Member had nothing to do with protection. The business people who wanted scientific and commercial development were the last people in the world to want any sort of tariff interference with their business. The only result of that debate was to show once more to an astonished country that the Opposition were hopelessly divided as to what they meant and wanted, and that the only Party that had the faintest idea of what they meant were the Liberal Party. If that end had been served once more he thought there would be some advantage to the country from the debate. During the last Parliament the members of the then Opposition tried unsuccessfully to ascertain what were the opinions of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London in regard to free trade and protection, but now apparently the members of the present Opposition were anxious to know what his opinions were. Whether they were satisfied or not with the speech the right hon. Gentleman had that day delivered, it was not for him to say. He hoped that the hon. Member for Ludlow would have an opportunity of addressing the House and stating what he thought about his leader's opinions. From a speech delivered by the hon. Member some time ago they gathered that he was unable to fathom what the opinion of his leader was. It would be interesting to know his opinion now. He himself claimed no particular capacity to interpret what the Leader of the Opposition had said on the question, but having read his speeches and his pamphlet, and having listened to his speech that day, he was bound to say that he was quite unable to fathom what the right hon. Gentleman meant, or what his views were in regard to tariff reform. What were the right hon. Gentleman's views in regard to duties on manufactured articles imported into this country, on raw materials, and on articles of food? The right hon. Gentleman had gone out of his way to avoid the mention of the word food. These were points on which the House ought to have some information before voting on the Amendment, which seemed to be capable of an enormous number of different constructions. The Budget of this year was not a Budget of despair; it made a perfectly clear pronouncement that the first duty of this country was to lessen its debt. They knew also that it provided for the nucleus of a fund for old age pensions. It was not an electioneering Budget, it did not try to provide social reforms on credit and not for cash, and it tried to meet obligations fairly and squarely. The important principle was acknowledged that there was to be a differentiation of the taxation of earned and unearned incomes. Some Colonials with whom he had recently been conversing told him that they had been struck with the extraordinary conditions in connection with our factories and workshops. A lady said to him that she was surprised at the enormous number of hours shops were open in this country. He thought he might say without disrespect to those members of the Party opposite who represented capitalists and landowners that those conditions represented their profits in some measure, and that they had very strong reasons for trying to draw something across the path of progress in that direction. They were anxious to prevent changes in the law which would interfere with the profits which they derived under present conditions. Therefore, when social reforms were proposed, they were always told by the Opposition that the Empire was in danger. The present Government had come into power with an enormous majority after a direct fight mainly on the question of free trade. That battle having been fought and won, it ought to be regarded as completely settled during the present Parliament. He had during the last few weeks received from tariff reform organisations communications asking him to support various proposals of colonial preference. These were practically requests that he should break the pledges which he gave to his constituents at the time of the election.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

---

## HUMBER CONSERVANCY BILL [LORDS].

(BY ORDER.)

Second Reading deferred till Monday, 27th May.

---

## FINANCE BILL.

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time:—"

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, and add the words "in the opinion of this House, the financial needs of the country, as disclosed in the Budget statement of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, require that the basis of taxation should be broadened, in order that the anomalies and hardships inseparable from the present high rate of particular taxes may be diminished, the revenue necessary for the public service and for social reform raised with fairness to all classes of the community, and our fiscal system adapted to the present condition of national and imperial trade,"—(*Mr. Austen Chamberlain*)—instead thereof, —resumed.

MR. RENDALL, continuing his speech, said that it was not right that hon. Members should be asked to break the promises which they had made to their constituents. As regarded the Amendment generally, they all felt that it had been drafted to rope in certain Members of the Unionist Party; but he could not help feeling that there were a good many Members on the other side of the House whose silence could not be construed otherwise than as indicating their opposition to the Amendment. He himself would have no hesitation in voting against it.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that one hon. Gentlemen after another on the Ministerial side had impressed upon the House that we were a free trade country. The statement was absolutely untrue. The import duties on the necessaries and luxuries of the poor came to about £25,000,000 a year; how could that be called even free imports for the poor, let alone free trade? There were also many millions of money taken every year in the excise duties on beer and spirits which were also largely used by the poor. On the hand, almost all our manufactured exports by which our working people earned their wages were very heavily taxed by other nations. Where, then, did the freedom of trade come in? He had never been able to make it out. If hon. Gentlemen opposite were to say that our system was one of State aid to foreign countries, he thought they would be much nearer the truth. Under our present system we were practically giving foreign nations an advantage on manufactured goods in our own market of about £12 in every £100 worth of goods which they sent to us. The reason was that our manufacturers had to pay in rates and taxes about £12 for every £100 of manufactured articles which they exported, while we allowed all foreign goods to come into this country without paying one half-penny towards rates and taxes. He would like to ask if any one would deny that proposition.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said that he would deny it.

MR. HUNT said he would give the hon. Gentleman his chance after he had done. On the other hand, foreign nations made us pay a great deal more than the equal of their rates and taxes for the goods we sent to them, so that we paid not only our own rates and taxes but a great deal more than their rates and taxes, as well as for the goods which we sent to them. Let them take the carpet trade. The charge on our carpets was £72 on every £100 worth of carpets sent to America. The head of an old firm of carpet manufacturers in his own constituency had told him that it was perfectly impossible to do trade with America now, unless they produced some new kind of carpet the design of which they had invented, but which the American manufacturers had not yet learnt to make. American carpets were sold in Bridgnorth, one of the homes of the carpet trade, whilst workers in the carpet trade in that town were obliged to be kept on short time. On the other hand, the Americans can send any number of £100 worth of their surplus carpets into this country without paying a halfpenny towards our rates and taxes, and, according to Mr. Carnegie's statement in his address to the students at St. Andrews University in Scotland, surplus goods do not even pay rates and taxes in their own country because the extra amount made does not increase the numerous general charges. In the case of carpets America has not only kept our carpets out by her high duties, but in the early nineties gave a bounty on exported carpets, and the effect was that several firms in Kidderminster closed their works, many looms were broken up and sold out of the country, and carpet weavers who had been earning £3 a week were left to starve, or attempt to get work as ordinary labourers at less than a third of their former wages. He (Mr. Carnegie) pointed to the industry of agricultural implements and showed how the Americans had triumphed and beaten us in our own market, so that now one agricultural implement maker made more machines in America than are made in the whole of Great Britain. The same unfair disadvantages applied to agriculture. Land in this country was heavily burdened by rates and taxes, and by death duties as well. When he was in America twenty-eight years ago he was told that, besides there being hardly any tax on the land, the work was done by niggers whose wages were much lower than those of agricultural labourers in this country. The farmers sent over their produce to this country, and also obtained preferential rates from our railway companies. Under those circumstances, he did not think that agriculture could be expected to flourish in England. What was wanted was to help the agriculturists and the agricultural labourers; but it must be on a different system from that proposed by the present Government. Could anybody explain how it was that we should have in this country such a number of unemployed and unemployable men? As the hon. Member for Woolwich had said, if a man was out of work for so many months he became to a certain extent an unemployable. China and Japan were becoming great manufacturing countries, and we should have in the near future to face products of the cheap labour of those countries. Goods manufactured by means of that cheap labour would soon be coming in free in increasing quantities. He would ask the Labour Party to bear in mind that in those countries a man worked for 8d. a day and a woman for 3d. or 5d. The supply of articles produced by means of that cheap labour was beginning to arrive already. He had recently bought in one of the best shops in London a Japanese table cloth, and he was told by the shopman that Chinese goods of a similar description were also coming in. It was by goods such as those that the Irish linen industry was being undersold. He would remind the House that the American Press had very strongly pressed upon the American people that if the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham came off it would do an enormous amount of harm to American trade and an enormous amount of good to British trade. Public men in America had also expressed the same opinion. The exchange of products benefited both buyer and seller, and there was a great difference between a home and a foreign market. With British home commerce both buyer and seller were Britons and both employed British workpeople; with foreign commerce only one was a Briton and one employed British workpeople. Hence home commerce was doubly profitable. But that was not all. Our coal and machinery being sold to go abroad helped to develop foreign industries, and those industries in return produced goods which competed with our manufactures. If our coal and machinery were, however, sold at home they would assist in developing home industries and in keeping our own workmen employed. About fifty years ago we made more iron and steel, manufactured more machinery, and wove more cloth than all the rest of the world. At the present time we were beaten in two great industries by America and Germany. We were becoming more and more the exporters of raw material and partly manufactured goods, whilst other nations were more and more sending us their finished products. In consequence of that state of things our people suffered terribly from want of work. During the ten years ending 1905 Germany took £63,000,000 in gold more from this country than we did from Germany. He could not help thinking that this went to show why employment was so plentiful in Germany whilst we suffered so much from want of employment in this country. Probably a large part of the £63,000,000 was spent in wages in Germany. From Great Britain, says the German official writer, Germany takes chiefly raw material and half finished goods, so that Germany may manufacture them themselves; and he added that German raw produce and semi-crude materials are now only sent to Great Britain in a very limited degree. Hon. and right hon. Gentleman opposite are always taking about what they call our invisible exports, chiefly ships and investments abroad. Mr. Perris, the present Secretary of the Cobden Club, had himself pointed out that our capital and plant had been steadily flowing abroad for the last fifty years. No doubt our money and machinery went abroad, but it employed foreign labour instead of British labour, and, not only that, it often employed very cheap labour which competed with our industries and our workmen at home. People who called themselves free traders made a great point about our great shipping trade, but from the working man's point of view our shipping trade really did the donkey work for the other nations of the world and humped their goods about. Even in that case we had to employ a number of foreign and Asiatic sailors, and he did not see where the benefit of that system came in. The President of the Board of Education told them yesterday that the poor paid enough in taxation. He should rather think they did. They paid an Empire tax of something about £25,000,000 a year upon the necessaries of life (if tobacco was to be counted a necessary, although it might perhaps be called a luxury). But, on the other hand, in the year 1906 there came into the country without paying a halfpenny of taxation such luxuries of the rich as ornamental feathers, silk manufactures, leather gloves, motor cars, fancy goods, musical instruments, toys and games, dressed skins and furs, and undressed skins and seal skins, excluding rabbit skins, to the value of £27,874,000. The Chancellor of the Exchequer could not put a halfpenny of taxation on these things, because it might help our people to get work and wages, and none of the money would come out of the pockets of the poor. The right hon. Gentleman said at Penzance in 1903 that the adoption of a tax of 2s. a quarter on corn would inflict a grievous burden on the poor; yet that worked out at a tenth of a farthing on 10 lbs. of wheat. The right hon. Gentleman this year said that after a careful review of the existing circumstances in connection with the tea duty, the reduction of 1d. in the pound would be of no relief to the consumer, and that if the sugar duty were halved it would be no good to the great bulk of the consumers. So that while something under a quarter of a farthing on a 4-lb. loaf would be a grievous burden to the consumer, although about half the supply would be untaxed, and therefore there would be competition with an untaxed supply, the reduction of 1d. a pound of tea, in regard to which there could be no competition with an untaxed supply, would make no difference to the poor people this year, although it was a great deal of good to them last year; and on sugar, which the right hon. Gentleman said was a food and a necessity of the poor, a reduction of a farthing a pound was no use. He supposed that they must remember that lawyers were educated, trained, and brought up to argue one day that black was white and the next day that white was black, but he really thought that the kind of argument used by the Chancellor was a trifle overwarm for ordinary working people. The Government had lost a great opportunity of consolidating the British Empire. They appeared to be so tied up with their gigantic election inexactitudes of big loaves and enslaved Chinamen, who, however, could not be persuaded to leave their slavery; and were so wedded to the old-fashioned, obsolete, out-of-date, wooden-headed, blind-eyed fallacies of Cobdenism, that if they had their deserts they would go down to history as the Ministry of inexactitudes, lawyers, and second-class parish councillors.

*MR. TOULMIN (Bury, Lancashire) said the hon. Member for Ludlow usually managed to entertain the House, but he had omitted one point from his speech on this occasion. They would have liked to have heard from him his opinion of the speech of his leader so that they might know whether in his opinion his leader had toed the line. That at all events was the object of this Amendment. It was in order that the country might get to know how the right hon. Gentleman stood with regard to this matter. He was mistaken as to our exports and imports. During the last three months our imports of raw material had increased by £6,500,000, and of manufactured articles by £1,333,000. Our exports of manufactured articles had increased by £6,000,000, and of raw material by £1,000,000. The hon. Member for North-West Lanark had endeavoured to put the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the horns of a dilemma with regard to the sugar tax. But he did not think his right hon. friend, in saying that if he took off a portion of the sugar tax this year no benefit would accrue to the consumer, was laying down a principle as to the general influence of the reduction of a tax. He understood his right hon. friend to mean that no benefit could accrue in the present state of the market. If the hon. Member claimed that whenever a tax was taken off the consumer always got the whole benefit he must also admit that when an extra tax was put on the consumer always paid it. Attention had been called to the speech of Mr. Gladstone in 1843 when he advocated a preference on corn to Canada. But at the time we had a tax on corn, and inasmuch as we were breaking down the tax we were proceeding in the direction of free trade, and it was not inconsistent to support Mr. Gladstone on that occasion. To-day hon. Members might see Canada and Australia breaking down the barriers between them and reducing taxation. He objected to a corn tax, not merely because it was protective, but because bread was the last resource of a person who had only one halfpenny to spend. It was the one thing that those who were poorest must have, and therefore in his opinion it ought not to be subject to taxation at all. He had never heard protectionists face the fact that where there was a protective duty the consumer paid both the duty and the increased price of the goods which did not come under that particular duty. The right hon. Member for St. George's desired to diffuse the burden of taxation by taxing more commodities. But why were these commodities chosen? Sugar was chosen in place of corn because the whole of the revenue went into the Exchequer. If they chose other commodities the consumer not only paid the whole duty, but also paid an increased price. What was the result in the case of the French corn tax? The price was not raised by the whole of the amount of the duty, but notwithstanding that, the consumer paid the duty many times over. Only 5 per cent. of corn was imported into France, and that 5 per cent. paid the Government 12s. 2d. per quarter. Ninety-five per cent. was home grown, but the price of the whole 100 per cent. was raised by 8s. a quarter. The price to the consumer was raised by 800 shillings, of which 60 shillings as duty went to the Government, and 740 shillings went elsewhere. One need not wonder at there being an enthusiastic army of advocates for such a system of taxation. The right hon. Member for East Worcester had said that our present fiscal system handicapped our industries; but no evidence had been adduced in favour of that contention. He repudiated that suggestion, and contended that our fiscal system provided a medium for an abnormal growth of industry, such as had never been seen in any other country since the world began. Certain industries which were highly specialised had a greater development here than anywhere else. Free trade provided a better soil and industries obtained a luxuriant growth. Let them take the textile and shipping industries. This country was not defenceless; we had cheap goods and cheap services which through free trade enabled us to bargain with any other nation in the world. Which nation with a tariff was able to get better terms than ourselves with other nations? He had some figures which would disprove the contention of the right hon. Gentleman that countries with tariffs could always keep their mills going. He would not go into details, but would merely quote—

> "By inquiries addressed to 1,233 Berlin hardware concerns it was found in October, 1901. there was a decline of from 15,000 to 18,000 workmen, chiefly adults, as compared with the corresponding months of 1900. In the iron-founding industry no less than 39 per cent of the workmen were discharged. A month later another 7,500 were thrown on the labour market owing to the cessation of the 'season' trades."

Of the 6,375 weaving looms at Aachen 1,231 were standing still and fully 1,300 men were without employment. So far as he had been able to discover, the seasons of depression, either in the United States or in Germany, were worse and more profound than here, and they recovered later and not sooner. Then again, the right hon. Gentleman had said that they could not put more capital into their mills. Really, to any one going over Lancashire, that seemed very peculiar, because he did not think that any one who took an hour's journey in any part of the spinning portion of Lancashire could fail to see a new mill either working or rising. How did free trade affect that? It enabled them to build mills more cheaply than any other manufacturing country. A mill which in England cost £125,000, in Germany cost £185,000, in France £200,000, and in the United States £250,000. The interest and depreciation alone on the extra money spent in the United States, was more than the wages which were paid to operatives in England. He was speaking entirely of the cost of building the mill before it was run. This "handicap" result was that in the Oldham district there were actually more spindles at work than in the whole of Germany. Was it not a most marvellous fact that we took America's raw material, although she was a manufacturing nation, brought it 3,000 miles across the sea, worked it up here, and then exported £100,000,000 worth of it to every quarter of the globe? [An HON. MEMBER: It has got less and less every year.] No; it had got more and more. Taking the figures for ten years, it had grown from £65,000,000 to £100,000,000. We were not taking as much extra raw material, but we were exporting greater value. Why? Because we were putting more work into it. He could not see any economic disadvantage whatever in that. We exported of goods, made from the raw material from America, ten times as much as they did. What was our record in regard to shipping? The right hon. Gentleman had referred to our supremacy in shipping as having been as great half a century ago as it was now. He thought the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken. In regard to the United States, which had everything that was required for shipping within its own borders—skilled workmen, iron, wood, water, magnificent waterways, and everything which ought to encourage it to be the greatest maritime nation the world had ever seen—why was it that we had in their ports 25,000,000 tons of shipping while they had in ours 1,500,000? The whole reason was free trade, because free trade gave us, in the building, the furnishing, and the working of our great steamers—which were not donkey-power as the hon. Member opposite had remarked—all the advantages which enabled us to build cheaply. These steamers had the the most highly organised engines that the world had ever seen. More skill went to the building of those ships, more intelligence and power in sailing them about the world and in conducting its commerce, than had ever been seen in any other industry. Our shipping industry was one of the marvels of the world at the present time. We not merely did the shipping between the United States and ourselves, but we did 14,000,000 tons of their shipping with other foreign nations, and that was how we paid for the corn and cotton which we got from them. In 1840 our maritime supremacy over France was four times, whereas it was now nine times as great; our mercantile navy was nine times that of France. In 1868 the United States had 2,500,000 tons of shipping compared with our 4,500,000 tons. In 1870 we were 5,500,000, and the United States 1,500,000 tons. In 1901 we had 9,500,000, and the United States had less than a million. That, in his opinion, and after reading what had been said by inquirers in the United States, was entirely owing to the fact that we were a free trade nation and they were not. We were threatened with Germany getting up to us. Between 1870 and 1900 the figures for Germany had doubled, but they had only added a million tons while we had added4,000,000. It would take Germany at that rate a long time to get up to us, although they had doubled and we had not. Our superiority over Germany in regard to steam was even greater. In 1880 we had 2,500,000 tons more in steam than Germany; in 1890 we had four and one-third millions more; and in 1900 we had 5,750,000 more steam tonnage than they had. He wished for the indulgence of the House while he turned to the Imperial side of the question. Lancashire was in the fore-front of this battle, not because of any accidental circumstance, but because she was interested in two of our great trades, shipping and cotton. Those were the two trades which would suffer most if the proposals of hon. Gentlemen opposite were adopted. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the preference proposals were the first great advance towards greater unity. He (Mr. Toulmin) said on the contrary, that if they began with tariff bargaining they would throw not an apple but a whole bushel of apples of discord between ourselves and the Colonies. We should set every trade in England examining the kind of injury which was done it by the colonial tariffs. The Leader of the Opposition had said that afternoon that without close relations they could not have unity. Close relations in what? Close relations in those things on which they could agree, and on which they could unite, but not close relations when they were actuated by absolutely opposite principles. On the one side they were protectionists; they at home were free traders, and to set them haggling on this point was to invite disaster. Sir Robert Peel repudiated haggling with foreign nations; they introduced haggling with our Colonies as a step towards free trade. What did that lead the Leader of the Opposition to? They had again that afternoon the schedule of forbidden industries in the Colonies. Nothing was more marked in the tour of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham than the fact that he referred to the industries which the Colonies were not to begin. That he believed was kept out—he hoped that he was correct in saying so—of the revised edition of his speech. Of course it must be left out. It was never intended that there should be a restriction of Colonial industries; otherwise, we should at once get to loggerheads with them. Now, the right hon. Gentleman said that they were to prevent the building up of industries in the Colonies, and we were to supply the manufactured goods. There they had something to quarrel about, because they were asking the Colonies to give up the whole basis of their policy. There had been a good deal said both inside the House and out of it, about the foreigner paying the tax. He was not going into the point whether the foreigner paid the tax, because, in reference to the question he was about to ask, he did not very much care which answer they gave. Who paid the tax imposed by Canada on Lancashire cotton? Whoever paid it, as he had said, it was a penalty and an obstacle to trade. He had not forgotten the campaign in regard to the Indian import duties, nor had he forgotten what hon. Members opposite had told Lancashire in regard to it. That was the occasion on which the present Chancellor of the Duchy defended India. Hon. Members opposite then said that the Indian 5 per cent. duty came out of the pockets of Lancashire. Very well then, out of whose pocket did the Canadian twenty-three and one-third come? Did it come out of the pocket of Lancashire or the Canadian consumers of Lancashire goods? He had said that the duty was an obstacle to trade between Canada and England. They gave us a preference, and so far as that went it reduced the obstacle and they welcomed it; so far as it was a sign of goodwill they welcomed it. In criticising Canada in this matter he hoped that it would be clearly understood that he was criticising only those who were advocating what they believed to be Canada's position in that House and outside of it. He had to look at the matter from the point of view of one whose welfare depended on that of Lancashire. He had business relations with three of the great trade centres of Lancashire, and he represented the fourth, and whatever did Lancashire harm would do himself the greatest possible harm. That might sound a selfish argument. They were told that Lancashire was selfish, and that her object in supporting free trade was selfish. Let that be so. Let them be taken as they were. Sometimes they had a rub at their neighbours, and they must be content to take a rub in turn. He had never known a Lancashire man get the better of a Yorkshireman in a horse deal. Let it be so. They were both of them hard men. Let the House beware of setting them bargaining. It would be the millions of Lancashire against the millions of Canada; and the millions of Yorkshire against the millions of Australia. What was the picture which the hon. Member for Aston Manor had given them of the Colonies? He had said they would be ready to prefer a reduction of Italy's tariff to our own open market. Did hon. Members believe that the Colonies would be ready to give benefits to Italy which they did not give to us, although we kept our doors open? This country bought from them every year £28,000,000, and they only bought from us £14,000,000. He hoped the

House would not take the hon. Member's estimate of the Colonies. Having an open market, we had not become adepts at tariff bargaining; but if Lancashire was to go in for bargaining then she must start at the beginning and go into it pretty thoroughly. What was the present position? Great Britain had given her Colonies freedom to tax Colonial purchasers of our goods. That freedom was greater than preference, nay it was even greater than equality, because in this particular case equality was greater than preference. Their absolute freedom was greater than any trade relations with us, however beneficial, could be. If Lancashire worked for Canada in the United Kingdom there were no obstacles to the payment from Canada, but if Lancashire wished to pay for Canadian corn how did Lancashire stand? What would be the position between Lancashire and Canada if they agreed to try to strike a bargain? Lancashire cotton was taxed 25 per cent. in Canada. Canadian corn was free in Lancashire. How, then, could Lancashire bargain with Canada for preference when there was this inequality between Lancashire cotton and Canadian corn? If they placed a tax of 25 per cent. on English purchasers of Canadian corn they would then be equal, and they could bargain. They only tolerated the present position in the name of political freedom and because they wished the Colonies to be absolutely free; but once set them to tariff bargaining, then the position would become intolerable. How did the position stand with regard to the suggested preference? What was the preference to be? Lancashire also dealt with the foreigner, and consequently Canada's position, according to the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite, would be "We, Canada, penalise your import trade into Canada. We have the thumbscrew on Lancashire to the extent of 25 per cent. If England will impose penalties on Englishmen dealing with foreigners we will relax the thumbscrew a turn or two off your Lancashire cotton. We cannot relax it altogether for fear of our own manufacturers." He protested against the false view taken of this preference by bringing in a comparison with the foreigner. Members opposite said "Look how Canada taxes the foreigner." His contention was that they must look at the position between Lancashire and Canada before they looked at the position between Canada and the foreigner. They had to look at the position of Canada and Lancashire in regard to cotton goods, and Canada and Yorkshire in regard to woollen goods. The effect of Canada's barrier was that we bought from Canada £28,000,000 and Canada bought from us £14,000,000. In the face of that fact Canada could not hoodwink them by diverting their attention to the foreigner and saying "We tax the foreigner more." That was not the question. They replied "Look how you treat our trade and how we treat yours; look how we treat your corn growers and our own upon an absolute equality; look how you treat your own cotton and woollen manufacturers and our cotton and woollen manufacturers." If once they accepted the tariff reform policy they would be committed to retaliation, preference and protection, and they would be putting into the hands of friends weapons with which they might mutually hurt one another, because inevitably every great trade would have to fight for its own hand, and where there was unity at the present moment, they would produce enmity. Where was the greater unity that would come from these negotiations? If it came to a general scramble, Lancashire would fight, and Lancashire would be right. The Colonies at the present time had fiscal freedom to tax any of our goods for the purposes of retaliation and protection. They taxed our goods and when they offered us a preference it was only a form of retaliation, because they put a duty on which they said they would take off if we would give them something in return. They could not adopt such a system by halves, but must adopt all its evils, jealousies, and strife. Lancashire now fought with a single eye for free trade. There was a great reserve of free trade strength in Lancashire to-day. Many thousands in Lancashire voted for Unionists at the last election, because they knew that free trade was safe, in fact the first day settled that, and that prevented the Unionist Party from falling to pieces. The hon. Member for Durham had spoken of 100,000 Unionist free traders, and he had no hesitation in confirming his statement so far as Lancashire was concerned. Lancashire Members were not receiving from their constituencies a shower of resolutions in favour of tariff reform. By free trade Lancashire had grown, and if they destroyed free trade they would increase the manufacturers' cost, burden the workers, hinder their customers' payments, and lay them open to retaliation the whole world over. Preference would bring no increased unity, but internal tariff wars, and would produce not bonds of unity, but burdens of bitterness. Canada herself made no such claim as had been suggested by those who wished to entrap her and get her to pull the protectionist chestnuts out of the fire for them. They were calumniators of the Colonies who represented them as already traitors in their hearts to the Empire. He would like to read to the House the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier—

> "The people of Canada did not come here as suppliants; they did not come here to ask for anything for their benefit; they asked the British people simply to consider whether such a policy would be in the interests of the British people. If the British people came to the conclusion that it would not be in their own interests, then Canada wanted none of it. He had read in some newspapers here that unless the British people gave a preference to Canada, unless there was mutuality of preference, that they in Canada were prepared to desert the British policy and to seek markets in the United States. That statement had no shadow of foundation. Their neighbours were well aware that whenever it came to a matter of competition in Canadian markets between products of the United States and products of Great Britain their choice was made—they stood by the Mother Country."

There was no system of preference which could be devised which was not unjust between Colony and Colony. It would give to the poorest of the King's dominions such as South Africa the least, whilst it would give to the richest Colonies like Canada the most. It would be unjust between the Home Country and the Colonies, and the various industries both at Home and in the Colonies. It would also be unjust between trade and trade. The House of Commons in its vote that night could not do better than respect the ripe political wisdom and the long experience of that great Canadian statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, expressed in his words—

> "If preference for preference were not given, however, their loyalty would remain the same. The courageous ancient Gauls were afraid only of one thing, and that was of the canopy of heaven falling. Those who entertain a doubt of the loyalty of Canada might just as well fear the fall of the blue vault of heaven. The future of the British Empire was absolutely secure so long as it rested upon the complete and untrammelled autonomy of all its component parts."

By that autonomy this Empire had been built up, and by that autonomy, without preference, it would stand.

*MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said he had listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. Member for Bury, because he remembered the excitement about the corn tax when he was first elected at a bye-election there. He remembered a speech made by the hon. Member in which he said that he was anxious to take the whole of the taxes off the poor. It seemed to him that the debate which had taken place had not touched to any great extent the question before the House, namely, the Second Reading of the Finance Bill, but was chiefly in regard to economic doctrine. He would like to say a word or two in reference to the taxing of the poor. The hon. Member for Gloucestershire, in what he might call a provocative speech, had said that the Unionist Party were dishonest. What he had stated was that the Unionist Members advocated the views they held upon tariff reform, not because they believed that tariff reform was in the interests of the country, but because it was in their own interest. He had also said that the resolutions passed in favour of tariff reform were dishonest resolutions. Surely the hon. Member knew that resolutions were passed upon every conceivable subject in almost every constituency, and it was the custom to send them to the Member of Parliament representing that particular constituency. He wished to deal for a moment with the question of taxing food. Hon. Members opposite had stated on many occasions that they would like to do away with the tax upon sugar. He believed that at the last election there were 131 Members who pledged themselves, under any circumstances, not to vote for any tax on sugar at all. The only excuse put forward for the sugar tax was that it was a payment for old age pensions. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham had on many occasions advocated contributions from individuals towards State-aided pensions, and if that was what this Budget meant there would have to be a compulsory contribution towards those pensions so long as there was a tax on sugar and tea. If those taxes were increased next year a great deal of the money would go towards old age pensions. They frequently saw at election time great placards "Vote for So-and-So and no taxes on food." It was often said by speakers on the Government side of the House that the people of this country would not stand taxes on their food; but the taxes upon food and drink excise and customs last year amounted to no less than £48,000,000. We were at the present time the greatest tariff State in the world. He was not at all a bigoted protectionist. If they taxed the things they produced instead of those they did not produce they did increase the price in the home market to some extent if the foreigner did not decrease the price of the article to the extent of the tax. Let them take the position of many firms in the north of England. Of course there was at present a very great deal of prosperity all over the country. His friends on the other side of the House knew that there were a considerable number of works stopped owing to the present fiscal conditions. Some of the owners of these works had gone abroad with their factories. If a man had to decide whether he would put up works in this country or in Germany he found that by putting them in Germany he had the advantage of a market of 60,000,000 people in Germany and 40,000,000 in this country. If a man had the offer of two pieces of land separated by a stream over which there was a bridge, and he was told that if he erected his factory on one side there would be a toll to pay if he brought his goods over the bridge, but that if he placed his factory on the other piece of land there would be no toll, there could be little doubt as to the place which he would choose for the erection of his works. That applied to our fiscal system at the present time. He was not going to advocate the system of Germany. He thought he might say however that in the interests of this country something should be done to alter our present system. Referring to the question of the income-tax, he appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider the present system which prevented people who paid the tax and who were not liable for it from getting their money refunded. This was a very hard condition. There were thousands of people who were paying income-tax which was not due by them to the State, and he hoped the Government would be able to do something to alleviate the hardship. He would give two instances. One was the case of an overdraft in respect of which £5,000 worth of shares were deposited with the bank against a loan of £4,000. The borrower had to pay income-tax on the interest which he received on his £5,000 worth of shares, but as he had to pay to the bank interest on the £4,000 of borrowed money, he was really only getting an income on £1,000. The great majority of the people did not know that they could obtain a refund of the income-tax in respect of such a transaction. The other case was that of poor people, of whom there was a large number, who had from £100 to £300 in some shares on which the income-tax was paid before they received the dividend. Those people whose incomes did not come within the taxable limit did not as a rule make any application for the tax which had been deducted. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer should do something to make the process of getting the money refunded simpler. If a graduation of the income-tax was going to take place in future, it should not be done on the lines advocated in the Budget. He admitted it was the clearest Budget statement he had heard in the House of Commons, but they were not carrying out the principle of taxing the people who were best able to pay. A poor widow left with a bare competence who had to pay 1s. in the £ income-tax was not so able to pay that tax as a bachelor earning £2,000 a year. He hoped these suggestions would receive the consideration of the Treasury.

Mr. HARWOOD (Bolton) said he did not think they could look forward to any decrease in the total cost of running the State, and therefore he regretted that the Government had given up the coal tax. There were certain advantages in that tax. One was that a portion of it—much the larger portion of it—was paid by the foreigner. Another was that it enabled the nation to get something out of its own property. As a Radical he had always held the opinion that the nation had property in its mineral wealth as well as in its land, and the coal tax was one of the means by which the nation could get something from its own. It was not enough that the miner should get his wages, the mineowner his profit, and the shipowner his freight. He wanted the people who were the owners of the coal to get something, but practically the nation at present was getting nothing beyond the ordinary profit of trade. But whether that tax was a good one or not, at any rate it brought in £2,500,000, and he would have preferred it to remain in order to make a beginning with old age pensions. He was deeply disappointed that a beginning was not made with the solution of that question. He held that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had anything to give, he should have begun by giving to those who needed it most. He did not think that the cost of old age pensions would be anything like what had been put before the House. There were a great many considerations in the calculation which he thought had not been given weight to. As an employer of labour he believed that of all classes of the community those who, beyond the people receiving the pensions, would derive the greatest benefit would be employers of labour. Fifty or sixty years ago that principle was discovered in the Poor Law. When the State subsidised wages it more or less gave a benefit to employers, and he believed it would be fair if they had to contribute a certain proportion to the solution of the pension problem. Therefore, he hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not be deterred from tackling the problem by any fear of treading on the corns of employers. The suggestion of the Opposition as to the method of raising money was about the worst possible. The Leader of the Opposition, while professing to be a free trader, said they were under the necessity of raising money, and that, therefore, he was inclined to favour the proposals for preference because they were a means of raising money. But surely that was going on the principle of "killing the goose that lays the golden egg." If the nation had to raise more money, the greater was the necessity that the business capacities of the nation should be untouched, and, therefore, if they weighted the nation with anything like these duties they would be impeding the nation in providing the additional wealth required. The suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition was contrary to common sense. The right hon. Gentleman had said he was in favour of free trade in principle. How did he justify his departure from that principle? He had said that free trade in the abstract was a right principle; there was no doubt about that; but it did not answer the case, because no one else adopted it. The right hon. Gentleman and his friends did not believe in the kind of free trade we had in England. On the Ministerial side of the House they did believe in it. If we were the only people to adopt free trade they would still believe in it. The Leader of the Opposition said, "Do you mean to say that England knows better than anybody else? Here are Germany, France, and the United States, and here are all our Colonies adopting plans of protection. Are you any wiser than they?" He thought we were, and there were many cases in which we had been wiser. He thought we had taught Continental countries and the Colonies a great deal more than they had taught us. We had taught them constitutional government, given them railways, and no end of things, and when he looked round he thought we were more likely to be right than they were. Who was suffering from the protection in Germany, France, and the United States? Speaker after speaker had talked as if protection in those countries had succeeded. He knew the industrial conditions of those countries pretty well, having close business relations with them, and he submitted that it was not protection which had succeeded. Why had German trade developed? It was because Germany had practically adopted free trade ever since the foundation of the Empire. He remembered when there were thirty different systems of customs in Germany. When the Empire was founded, those were swept away, and Germany had prospered, not by protection, but by her free trade. He wished to speak respectfully of France. He read an article in a French paper the other day on the question "Is France prospering?" He gathered from it that the French people were coming to the conclusion to which observers had come for some time, that the system there was not prospering. Considering her natural advantages France was not prospering as she would have done under free trade. He was very strongly of opinion that if the United States adopted a policy of free trade it would be a great danger to England, considering the enormous natural advantages of soil, climate, minerals, and rivers which that country possessed. He did not think that we could compete with the United States under those circumstances. Again, the United States was an instance of the advantages of free trade. There were no customs duties between one State and another. The United States was a cosmos, and within its vast continental borders they had all the advantages of free trade. Their prosperity was due to free trade; where there was failure it was due to protection. It was said that we had not been perfectly frank in regard to the business relationships between the Colonies and the Mother Country. The Colonies said to us—"You are to jeopardise four-fifths of your trade in order to develop one-fifth of your trade with us." But, in the first place, they would not give us their trade; and, in the second place, they had not got it to give. He spoke from his own personal experience. The Colonies treated the trader in this country worse than anyone else in the world. He said to his Colonial friends, "Do you mean to admit my goods on the same conditions as we admit yours in this country?" And they frankly said, "No; we cannot afford it, but we will give a preference." They acknowledged that they built a wall against us, but the preference they offered was that they would add another twenty feet to that wall against the foreigner. But what use was that to the traders in this country? As a matter of fact, the duties against his goods were greater in Canada and Australia than they were in Germany and France. It was said that if we did not close with the Colonial offer they would make terms with someone else. As a business man he wished to do business with any one who would do him good; and the closer they kept to the business point of view the better it would be. Where would the Colonies find anyone to treat them better than we did? The whole of the Colonies did not contain as large a population as the two counties of Lancashire and Yorkshire. Hon. Members opposite said that we should think of the future. He maintained that we should think of the present at first. Another striking thing was that the Colonies were wedded to their protective system. But how did the tariff system work in the Colonies? He said frankly that Australia was not a progressive country at all, it was non-progressive. Its population was not increasing. Its wealth was not increasing. The one Colony which adopted protection in its most severe form was the one Colony which did not prosper. Hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House were often charged with not realising the greatness of the Empire. From his point of view, they were proud of the Empire, and he had taught his children to be proud of the Empire, because it had stood as no other country in the world had done for liberty, freedom, and righteousness. He was so proud of the Empire that he trembled lest anything should be done to put it in jeopardy. They were told that a relationship that was not founded on interest was not a solid relationship, and an hon. Gentleman opposite had instanced the case of matrimony. But the matrimony which was founded on money considerations was sure to end in failure, and in an unhappy life. It was the nexus of money that had broken up Empires in the past; and it was money and considerations of tariff which had lost to this country the United States. He remembered when he was young hearing Mr. John Bright speaking in his father's house on this subject and saying—

> "We are trying to build an Empire upon sentiment. I do not know if we shall succeed, but I am certain that on no other basis will we succeed."

There never had been an Empire in the whole history of the world which had been so successful as ours in binding together its elements of loyalty and high feeling, and that was because we had never tarnished it with money considerations. We said to the Colonies: "Do as you like in your own interest." We treated them as a father treated his children; and one and all came back to us for advice and assistance. But once we began to bargain and haggle the whole thing would break up. In a great question of this kind we had a right to ask what was the true ideal for nations to strive after. The world had been made by the Almighty with great varieties of soil and capacity for production. Was the right ideal that nations should build walls round themselves?

No; the right ideal was not that nation should strive against nation, but that all should participate in the benefits of all; and he hoped that this country would adhere to that ideal.

MR. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down began his speech by repeating very much the same line of thought which has been used by everyone from those benches. He admitted that our existing means of taxation was not equal to the demand, and he proceeded to say that anything in the nature of this Amendment would make things worse. That is common ground; but my hon. friend is always original, and he did not keep long to the beaten track. He said that protection was built up by self interest, and he summed this up by saying that he, a business man, could not sell to the Colonies because the duties were so high. I would point out that the extent of the protection of any duty does not depend upon the size of the duty, but the extent to which it is protective. I do not know the nature of the hon. Member's business. [HON. MEMBERS: "Muslin."] I put it to him. Does he sell more muslin to the Colonies with the higher duty than to Germany with the lower duty?

MR. HARWOOD: To Germany, decidedly.

MR. BONAR LAW: That does not in the least alter the argument I put before the House—namely, that the extent of the protection does not depend on the amount of the duty. A small percentage of duty in a highly-developed country like Germany is more protective by far than a much higher duty in a country where manufactures are not highly developed as in the Colonies. I was taught at school that America was going some day to adopt free trade, and then look out for us. As the hon. Member said, when that view was expressed more than thirty years ago there was much more chance of its being realised than to-day, because there was then a political party in the United States which advocated free trade. There is no political party of any size in the United States to-day, however, which recommends the system which prevails in this country. The hon. Gentleman says that Germany has prospered because she has free trade; I do not want protection greater than the free trade which has been so prosperous in Germany. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was wrong in his corrections of my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition. For more than a generation after the abolition of our Corn Laws we had an effective entry into the markets of the world, because their manufactures had not grown up. So much was that the case that even so recently as 1879, when Bismarck altered the fiscal system of Germany, he was able to point out to the German people that the system which then prevailed in Germany had the effect of making Germany the dumping ground for England, and that by no other means than protection could they build up industries in Germany. If the right hon. Gentleman imagines, or tries to get other people to imagine, that the problem is the same as that with which Peel had to deal he has not begun to realise the A B C of the fiscal question. I challenge the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give any evidence for his statement that Peel never expected that our adoption of free trade would break down the tariffs of other countries. I say you will not find anywhere in Peel's speeches anything which does not agree with the assertion that is constantly made by Cobden that the effect of our adoption of free trade would be to compel other countries to adopt free trade also. Peel said he was going to fight hostile tariffs by free imports—[MINISTERIAL cheers]—yes, but he meant that he was going to beat them by free imports. These statements of Cobden and the implied acquiescence of Sir Robert Peel are not accidental. They are part of their deliberate philosophy on this subject. Not merely were they free importers, but they were free-traders, which meant free exchange, which meant buying as well as selling, and it was part of their policy that they should have both. That was the prospect they held out to the people of this country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer also reminded my right hon. friend that in the Cobden treaty with France there was nothing contrary to free trade principles. There are few things in a dialectic way which the right hon. Gentleman is not capable of, but I do not think that even he is capable of proving that, and for three good reasons. In the first place, Cobden himself admitted that it was contrary to free trade principles—["No"]—in the second place, Mr. Gladstone, who carried through the treaty, took the same view; and in the third place, Mr. Gladstone himself, in defending the treaty in the House of Commons, defended it on the curious ground that at the cost of a small loss of revenue we had gained a great extension of trade—the very argument used this afternoon by my right hon. friend in recommending preference. The discussion on the Budget is so wide that it is difficult to get out of order and difficult to make a selection. I shall take the line of the speech made by the right hon. Gentleman in introducing the Budget. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget statement said that he proposed to budget for some years ahead. That was very interesting, and reminded me that Mr. Gladstone once made a similar attempt and failed. When the right hon. Gentleman made the same attempt I listened for the development, but that development never came. There was nothing in his speech to show he is looking ahead except two things which are important. The right hon. Gentleman did make it clear to the House that for two or three years, the life of the present Parliament, we are to have no remission of taxation. The income-tax is to remain at a shilling, and the duties on tea and sugar are to continue for that period. For the present there is to be a burden; the advantage is all in the future. I feel that this is by far the most momentous Budget that has been presented to Parliament in my Parliamentary career. It marks, I believe, the beginning of the end. It is a confession of impotence, an admission that even from the point of view of revenue we have reached the limit, and that our fiscal system is on the verge of bankruptcy. Let me examine that statement in the light of the facts which have been presented to us in connection with this Budget. The right hon. Gentleman looks forward to having a surplus of £2,250,000, which is to be applied, if nothing happens, to old age pensions next year. But that surplus is dependent on many things. It is dependent on no other demands more pressing being made in the meantime on the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and, as was pointed out by my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, if a Bill which is now before the House is carried, a quarter of that surplus will immediately disappear. It depends also on the revenue proving at least as productive in the next year as it has been in this year, and that depends upon our trade on the whole continuing in at least as good a state as it is at present. It is true that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Education told us yesterday that it was not only going to continue at the present level, but was going to get better, but he proved it in a curious way by pointing out that up to the end of 1905, we were having a bad period of trade. Has the right hon. Gentleman forgotten his election speeches? There is not a gentleman on the Government Benches who did not point out that the boom in trade had completely knocked the bottom out of protection. The yield of revenue is dependent on a better state of trade. That may be realised, but I think it is doubtful. Of this I am sure, that the majority of business men in this country believe that we have now reached the top of the boom. But it depends on more than that. It depends on the expenditure for our defensive forces not exceeding the amount put down in the Estimates. I do not claim to be an Army expert. I am one of the few Members of the House who do not make that claim. But is that likely to be realised? Judging only from the speeches of hon. Gentlemen opposite, I have arrived at the conclusion that the Army scheme of the Secretary for War, if it succeeds at all, is going to cost a great deal more than he estimates. But we have something more to go upon in the fact that only recently the right hon. Gentleman had to divert money that was going to the Sinking Fund, a system of finance so unsound that nearly a dozen of his supporters voted against him. Then as to the Navy, we know now from the First Lord of the Admiralty that it is the intention of the Government to keep the Navy at its present scale of superiority over other nations. That means that the control of our expenditure on the Navy is entirely taken out of our hands, and depends not on this Government, but on what is done by other Governments over which we have no control. In the face of these considerations is it not at least probable that in a short time the right hon. Gentleman may be face to face with these alternatives—either to increase still further the enormous height of the taxation with the existing duties, or to put a tax on something which is not taxed now? It is true, as was pointed out by the hon. Members for North Paddington and Leicester this afternoon, and an hon. Member yesterday, that he might have another alternative, the alternative of making this country a place very undesirable for the rich man to live in, and still more undesirable for him to die in, but the amount of money which could be derived even if he adopts such a course will inevitably be very small. That brings us to the main purpose of the Amendment—the widening of the basis of taxation. My right hon. friend tried to explain what this meant. [Ironical MINISTERIAL Cheers.] I thought he explained it—[MINISTERIAL laughter]—and if he failed—I am not sure whether he failed or whether Members are laughing at their own inability to understand him—if he failed, then I have not much chance of succeeding. I will take the same illustration which he used. Suppose the Chancellor of the Exchequer has to get £10 out of men of a particular class. On the average, he estimates on getting £10 out of income-tax, or £10 from sugar, or £10 from the motor car. In the long run, one man averaging another, the Exchequer will get the same amount of money. But the effect on the individuals in this class will be very different. If the money is raised by one-third on each of these articles, what will happen? A man who has a bad year pays no income-tax, and he does not buy a motor-car; and if it is all raised on sugar, however little or much money he has made in the current year, he will use approximately the same amount of sugar, and he will suffer as he would not have suffered if the burden had remained on the other articles. Hon. Members may agree or disagree with my views, but I hope they understand what those views are. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that he had shut himself off from this wider basis of taxation, but he justified it on grounds which were perfectly satisfactory to him. He justified it by the illustration (and a very good one from his point of view and I believe he must have thought so), that he had only blocked himself off from unsound and marshy ground. Illustrations are not arguments, and nobody knows better than the right hon. Gentleman how easy it is to find them. If his illustration represents the facts he is wise. If it does not represent the facts then he is not wise. I will give him an illustration which I think is much more appropriate. The right hon. Gentleman has waiting for him a dwelling-house. It seems to be desirable, it apparently meets all his requirements, but he will not enter it. Why? Not because its foundation is insecure, but because there is a current report, which he is superstitious enough to believe, that it is haunted. The right hon. Gentleman is not very consistent even himself. If this kind of thing is marshy ground, there are present, as he well knows, in this country industries like that of tobacco manufacturing and the cocoa trade which are resting on this marshy ground. Why does he not remove them? If the duties on those industries are so bad, why does he leave them there to vex the country? He gave an explanation with regard to the cocoa duties which did not seem to me to be quite adequate. He admits that there is severe protection there, but he leaves it alone, the only reason, as I understood, being that Mr. Gladstone was a free trader and did not touch it. I do not think that is quite sufficient. In the first place, the conditions are different now. In Mr. Gladstone's time the principle on which our taxation was based was never challenged. It is challenged now. It is because it is challenged—I know of no other reason; I do not suppose it was vindictiveness—that the Chancellor of the Exchequer last year removed the arrangement with regard to stripped tobacco, which was far less protective, and which was introduced by the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer. But there is something more to be said. I may be wrong, and I give it to the House for what it is worth. The duty on these commodities remains the same but the protection is probably not the same. The cost of manufacture, if it is like other things, must have been greatly reduced, and, therefore, as the duty on the raw material and the manufactured article is the same, the probability is that the protection on cocoa industries now is at least twice what it was in the time when Mr. Gladstone fixed the duty. I confess that if anyone had moved an Amendment to remove these anomalies, I would hardly have known which way to vote. On the one hand, I believe the arrangement is not a bad one—that the country gains more than it loses by the flourishing of these industries in its midst. But on the other hand, there are other industries which might be benefited in the same way, and from the point of view of having these other industries benefited it is very desirable that all the people, whose interests ought to be the same, should be placed in precisely the same boat, and dealt with from precisely the same point of view. Another consideration is this: I think it very unreasonable and most unfair that the large fortunes which are made in this country out of the protection of these industries should be used as they are to subsidise newspapers and to help to finance Members of Parliament whose influence is used to prevent other people getting precisely the same advantage as they enjoy, and without which advantage there would be none of the money to spend in this way. Now I come to the remarks of the Chancellor of the Exchequer about the tea and sugar duties. What he said about the tea duty is really very amusing to me. Last year the House will remember he took a penny off the tea duty because it was going to benefit the consumer. This year he does not take off a penny because it would not benefit the consumer. When right hon. and hon. Gentlemen quote what they are pleased to call axioms of political economy against us, they speak as if these things were the laws of nature, as inevitable as the law of gravitation; but apparently the right hon. Gentleman is able to suspend the laws of nature. They only apply when they suit him; and they do not apply when they suit us better than they do him. My right hon. friend the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer said this was an extraordinary explanation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said in reply, "There is such a demand for tea all over the world that I am informed if you take 1d. off the duty, the consumer would get no benefit." I will put the reverse of that: There is so little demand for tea, and the price is already forced down so low that if you take 1d. off, the middleman will get the benefit of the whole of it. That statement is like the other, and I think it is as good and perhaps a little better than the other, and I would suggest it for the use of the right hon. Gentleman in his next year's Budget. Then the Chancellor of the Exchequer came to the sugar duty, and I noticed that what he said about it was not cheered by hon. Gentlemen behind him. I am not surprised it was not cheered, but I am surprised that the right hon. Gentleman should have used the argument that no benefit would result from taking off half the sugar duty, because the farthing is an unknown coin in retail business. The right hon. Gentleman is an economist, if he will allow me to say so without offence. The right hon. Gentleman confessed a few months ago that he boasted in his salad days that he had not only studied political economy but had actually taught it. Well, that is fatal. When a man has gone through that experience it has only one effect, which is that the knowledge disappears and the prejudices remain and cannot be shaken. I challenge the right hon. Gentleman to produce any economist in the world, of any school, who would make himself responsible for the assertion that the want of a coin has anything to do with the incidence of a tax. When Sir Michael Hicks Beach introduced his duty on corn some of his hon. friends used the same argument. They said it is only a half-farthing on a 4℔. loaf, and will mean nothing to the consumer. Did the right hon. Gentleman accept that argument then? If the argument is inapplicable in the one case it is inapplicable in the other, unless the laws of political economy are to be varied to suit the Liberal Party, and the incidence which affects the cost by way of increase is to have no effect by way of subtraction. The President of the Board of Education said that what we mean by widening the basis of taxation is to transfer the burdens which are now borne by the rich to the backs of the poor; and nothing that he said was more loudly cheered by his supporters. In a speech which otherwise I thought was very able I was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman should make that statement. That is the most absolute claptrap, and the right hon. Gentleman must know it. More than that, it is absolutely untrue, and he ought to know it. Owing to the system on which we levy our indirect taxation, there is no country in the world in which that taxation bears so hardly on the poor as it does in this country. That is inevitable. We put indirect taxation on articles of food and drink, and that means that a man is taxed not in proportion to his ability to pay but according to his capacity to eat and the extent of his thirst. We put taxation only on articles of food and drink, and the result of that system must have the effect that a far larger part of the burden falls on the poorer classes. [Hear, hear.] If the right hon. Gentleman agreed, why did he make that statement?

Mr. McKENNA: Because we have other taxes, such as income-tax and death duties, and I understand the broadening of the basis of taxation was proposed in order to reduce the income-tax.

Mr. BONAR LAW: No such statement was ever made. ["Oh."] All any one said on our side of the House was that both the income-tax and the indirect taxation of sugar and tea were too high. Taxation on other things was suggested as a means by which this excessive taxation might be relieved. There is no proposal, as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to imagine, to put on this taxation unless more money is needed. There is nobody who would not propose to relieve indirect taxation to the same extent as direct taxation is relieved

Mr. McKENNA: It was proposed, on the Resolution, to reduce the income-tax to 11d.

Mr. BONAR LAW: I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that it was also proposed to do away with the tea duty and the sugar duty. There is one other matter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has stated that it is impossible to have any system of preference without the taxation of raw material, because it would be so unfair to the different Colonies as compared with each other. In the first place, let me point out that this proposal for preference came not from my right hon. friend the Member for West Birmingham, but from the Ministers of the different Colonies in the first Conference, and it has been persistently pressed by them ever since. If, therefore, you want to find out what the proposal means, you must go to the authors of the proposal. There is no suggestion that duties should be imposed so as to be equally favourable to all parts of the Empire. All that is asked is that preference should be given on any duties in this country. More than that, if the difficulty exists, it exists in the Colonies between themselves. Yet they are making these arrangements—I do not say behind our backs, but in our presence—they are making these financial arrangements from which we are excluded. Nobody suggests that the advantage between one Colony and another is exactly equal. Let us for a moment look at this thing upon its merits. The right hon. Gentleman judges the value of preference by our existing trade; but that is begging the whole question. The Colonies desire preference because they believe that it will alter the whole course of trade and make an entirely new arrangement of their business. Take as an illustration the case of Ireland. Hon. Members representing Ireland took a great deal of trouble this year to carry through a Bill to enable them to grow tobacco in Ireland. Upon the right hon. Gentleman's principle what is the value of that? The value is in the future and will not be derived until after the passing of the Bill. The argument has been frequently used that we cannot give Australia a fair preference except on wool, but any Australian statesman would tell you that the wool trade would take care of itself, that they did not want to be a one horse country, and that though their exports of wheat were smaller than their exports of wool, yet a preference on wheat that would stimulate it would be of enormously greater value to them than a preference on wool. The right hon. Gentleman really looks at this question from the wrong point of view, if I may say so, and it is wrong for this reason. He is against preference, he does not believe in it, and, therefore, he hunts for arguments which will make it impossible; but if he could imagine that he was in favour of it in principle, then objections like that which he has stated, and like those used by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, would disappear. They would not be worthy of consideration assuming that you wanted to carry the thing through. If you make that assumption, look at the position in which the right hon. Gentleman places himself. He represents to the country that he goes to the Colonies with whom there is a proposal to make this arrangement. He is the seller for us, but he acts both as the buyer and seller. He says, " That is what we have got to sell, but I advise you not to accept it, because it is not worth having." That was undoubtedly the position he put himself in the last time he spoke on the subject. But if South Africa came and said, " We are unfairly treated," the same answer was not to be given. The assumption of the right hon. Gentleman is based on the deep-rooted idea that the Government are not only best able to judge what is best for us, but also what is best for the Colonies. It was the feeling that that is the attitude of the Home Government which made Mr. Deakin good-humouredly, but evidently with some feeling, say that what the Home Government thought should be done with the representatives of the Colonies was that they should be brought over here occasionally in order that they might be given admonition and advice. Does the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that they needed it ?

MR. ASQUITH: Not at all. I say they gave us quite as much advice as we gave them.

MR. BONAR LAW: That is a reasonable arrangement. With an arrangement of that kind no one can find fault. The right hon. Gentleman, in the course of his speech this afternoon, got extremely indignant and very eloquent about what he called the reptile Press on the fiscal reform side, and the dirty Party capital they try to make out of the Colonial Conference. I should be sorry if that has been done. It is not desirable from any point of view that the Colonies should regard one of the Parties in the State as their enemy. But the right hon. Gentleman must feel that in this kind of thing fiscal reformers at their best are only amateurs, that in such a business it is the Liberal Party who are the professionals, as the success of their efforts over Chinese labour proved. But I have a serious charge in this connection to make against the right hon. Gentleman himself. I shall put it very moderately. I felt that the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman in reference to the offer of preference by Australia were altogether unjustified and that they would have the effect of conveying to the people of this country the idea that the proposals of Australia were entirely different from what the proposals were. The right hon. Gentleman said the Bill of the Prime Minister was all they had to go on. Was an offer a Bill ? What Mr. Deakin said on introducing the Bill was that it was a preliminary overture, that it was no more than the first step on the road they desired to travel, and along which they should proceed with the Mother Country in amity together for all time. Was it fair to assume that all the Australians offered was contained in that Bill ? Without saying more on the political aspect of the question, there is one aspect of preference the friends of closer union desire to put forward. Is it not the fact that all the Colonial Premiers and all the Colonies consider that the first and only practical step towards closer union is by means of trade relationship ? [AN HON. MEMBER: " No."] Is that not a reason for thinking long and carefully before turning a deaf ear to the proposals they make ? Is it not a reason for giving anything we can give without disadvantage to ourselves ? I maintain that the Government could without any disadvantage have given preference upon existing duties, and the Under-Secretary for the Colonies has pointed out that a duty taken off is a benefit to either party. Why has that not been done ? The President of the Board of Education gave the reason. He said the Colonies could do it because it did not alter their system, but that we cannot do it without breaking down our fiscal system. That is plausible, but it was not sound. It was a Government of free-traders in 1892–5 who introduced into India a system of revenue duties without corresponding excise, and they did so for the sake of revenue. It was then an object of sufficient importance for them to waive their theoretical objections; but now they do not think the object of sufficient importance to prevent them from sacrificing it on the altar of pedantry. A great deal has been said on the economical side of this question. I would like to point out briefly the advantages of preference. I can only repeat the arguments which I have used before, but I am justified in repeating them for they have never been answered. Even now for our total exports of manufactured goods the best market is to be found in the British Empire, and in the Empire the best market is in the Colonies. ["No."] Gentlemen who deny that should look at the figures; I have done so. Of course, I know we are told that it is illusory to make a distinction between manufactured goods and raw materials. The fiscal system of every country in the world except ours, however, is based on that distinction, and on nothing else; it aims at encouraging the importation of raw material, at discouraging the importation of manufactured goods, at encouraging the export of manufactured goods, and discouraging the export of raw material. Can any one doubt that a distinction which works in every country but our own is a real and vital one? The value of the Colonial trade is not in the present only; it lies in the future. These countries are only just beginning their development. If we choose we may have a share in the enormous trade which they are going to do with some one. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have told us since the beginning of this controversy that goods must be paid for by goods. The Colonies, for generations at least, must be great exporting countries, and they cannot export unless they import. That is a platitude; it is common ground in every school of economics; yet hon. Gentlemen think they have discovered therein an argument for free trade. These countries must be great importing countries, and, however high they may have to erect their tariff walls, if the preference is high enough we are certain of securing that the immense trade will be in our hands.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): But for brief interludes a singularly languid interest has been taken in the whole discussion. That is due to the striking fact that after three years campaigning the country and the Members of this House have satisfied themselves on this great question, and now we are able to see the result. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down is always frankly protectionist. He has indulged in a series of gloomy predictions not only as to the future of the Colonies, but also as to the decline of our own industries. These gloomy predictions are not made for the first time to-night. Three years ago, addressing the House on the subject of the iron trade—about which he is one of the first authorities—the hon. Gentleman stated that before twelve months were past the production of steel in America would be so great that they would overflow their own requirements.

MR. BONAR LAW: I would like to know when I did say that?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I think the hon. Member will recollect [OPPOSITION cries of "Quote."] he anticipated that the over-production in the United States would be so great that the United States would be exporting rails to this country at £2 10s. before long.

MR. BONAR LAW: "Before long" and "twelve months" are very different.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The hon. Gentleman will not expect me to go into the definition of what is "before long." The hon. Member, a prominent protectionist, admits quite fairly that a country cannot export unless it imports. Therefore, he granted at once the first hypothesis upon which free trade is founded. The hon. Member attacked the Budget of this year because he said it was a confession of impotency and had no elasticity about it. He said we had in fact reached the limits of our present fiscal system. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer was responsible for a Budget based on this system in 1905, and he deplored the fact that he was bound by the free-trade pledges of his Government and was not able to add any elasticity to our national finance. I venture to say that the right hon. Gentleman did not realise that our national finance depended on both revenue and expenditure. We have succeeded in making our expenditure elastic, and for the first time for many years there has been a reduction in Army and Navy expenditure without any diminution in the efficiency of either service. Let us take what has been done under this inelastic system. During the last two years we have sanctioned no more expenditure under Military Works and Naval Works Acts. The amount spent under the Naval and Military Works Acts has gone down to no more than £2,500,000, and next year I believe not a single penny will be spent under them, and the capital expenditure will now be borne boldly on the annual Vote. That is one example of the way in which this inelastic system of ours has been expanded. Take the Sinking Fund. In 1905 the Sinking Fund was destroyed. In 1906–7 the Sinking Fund was made effective to the extent of nearly £10,000,000, and in 1907–8 it will be made effective by over £14,000,000. In addition to that, during that period we have succeeded in reducing taxation on tea, coal, and earned incomes. That alone is sufficient proof that the system which the right hon. Gentleman found inelastic has been found by his successors to be the most elastic system in the world. The right hon. Gentleman is an advocate of broadening the basis of taxation. My right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education put his own interpretation on that phrase, and it was the only sensible interpretation, namely, that the basis of taxation was to be found in the taxpayer. What is meant by broadening the basis of taxation is that there should be a greater variety of indirect taxes. I will give the House some idea of the effect of broadening the basis of taxation in the early part of the nineteenth century, when the tariff was formed by William Pitt, Sir Robert Peel, Sir F. Baring, and George Canning, all scientific financiers. The scientific tariff of those days covered a large number of articles. In 1821 no less than 1,709 articles appeared on the tariff. In 1842 the number was 886. In almost every year that followed a large number of articles were taken off the tariff, and the number was reduced to 389 in 1859 and to 112 in 1863. At the present time there are something like ten classes on which customs are levied. During that period the return from indirect taxation has remained at practically the same amount, of about £23,000,000, until during recent years, when it has gone up to £32,000,000; showing that as the variety of the tariff is diminished the productivity of indirect taxation was increased. From the year 1835 to the year 1855, the great period during which we were narrowing the basis of taxation, some nine and one-third millions of duties were taken off. They have been removed and the customs revenue has not varied during the period more than £1,000,000 one way or the other. The experience of the nineteenth century has shown, first, that our tariff should be simple; and, secondly, that by a simple tariff the cost of collection is diminished. The cost of collection in this country, with its higher wages, is less than in any other civilised country in the world. In Germany the total cost amounts to no less than 10 per cent. of the total duties collected. In France it is 7 per cent.; in the United States of America 3·5 per cent.; while in the United Kingdom it is only 2½ per cent. The cheapness of the collection is put down to the fact that the bulk of the import duties is collected on a small number of articles. What is put forward as the alternative to our present fiscal system? Four definite proposals have been put forward. Every one of them is said by its supporters to provide funds not only for a reduction in direct taxation, but sufficient to carry through some of the great social reforms which are now looked for. The first is that there should be a 5 per cent. duty on all imports into this country. Then there is another subject of a kindred nature which also received the blessing of Mr. Deakin at the Colonial Conference, and that is a proposal for a

1 per cent. duty on foreign imports into the Empire for Imperial purposes. In the United Kingdom such a duty would produce £4,500,000 sterling; in Australia it would produce—the inequality is worth noting—£100,000: in New Zealand £20,000; in Canada £400,000. What is the £4,500,000 for the United Kingdom to do in the way of reducing income-tax or providing funds for social reform? If used as Mr. Deakin intends, it will be used for another purpose. If used for a 1½d. reduction in the income-tax there will be absolutely nothing for old age pensions. Another proposal is that we should have duties on corn, meat, and other foodstuffs. We have had experience of a duty on corn. It produced £2,500,000 sterling. That would be sufficient to wipe off something less than 1d. of the income-tax, and would provide nothing for social reform. Another proposal is that there should be a duty of 10 per cent. on foreign manufactured goods imported into this country. The total produce of this duty would be something like £13,000,000, if the goods came in. That would be sufficient to provide the poor of this country, over sixty-five years of age, with a pension of 2s. 6d. a week, and nothing would remain for the relief of the income-tax payers. Such proposals as have been put forward in concrete terms by right hon. Gentlemen opposite would not provide for any of the great schemes which under a free trade Budget I believe we shall be able to carry out in the ordinary course, if allowed to carry out our intentions. It has been suggested that we have somehow been responsible for the Colonies bargaining with each other behind our backs. If they are prepared to bargain behind our backs for a reduction of their tariffs I do not see why we need grumble. A great deal of rubbish has been talked about trading with the Colonies. We do not trade with the Colonies, but with merchants who inhabit the Colonies. And let it be remembered that the Australian corn-grower, wool-grower, wine-grower, or manufacturer is no more entitled to consideration from this Government than the poor who inhabit our great towns. The hon. Gentleman embarked on a discussion as to the views of Cobden when he advocated free trade and negotiated the French Treaty. Here are Cobden's own words, as set out in the "Life of Gladstone" by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India—

> "I will undertake that there is not a syllable of our treaty that is inconsistent with the soundest principles of free trade."

The Government and its supporters advocate free trade, not because of our adherence to a theory or doctrine, but because of its business advantages. We believe it to be good business for our manufacturers, our carriers, and our consumers. In the long run an import duty tends to delay a fall in the price of the imported commodities, and it also accelerates a rise in the price which the consumer is bound sooner or later to pay. If the consumer does not pay, who pays? Is it the foreigner? ["Yes."] If the foreigner pays 10 per cent. on manufactured goods, why do we not put on 100 per cent. when we are about it? If the foreigner pays the import duties it is clear that the price in this country will not rise, and if the price will not rise it is certain that the Colonists cannot get an effective preference here, and that we must go on with that import duty until the price is affected in order to give an advantage to the Colonies. If the foreigner pays and not the consumer, will the hon. Gentleman kindly tell me why raw material should be excluded, or bacon, or maize? The truth is that hon. Gentlemen opposite are insecure. They have some doubts in their own minds as to some duties which would in some way be paid by the consumer. The real fact with regard to our trading position is that we buy foreign goods because we want them. We rely on foreign countries because they supply what we want. We wish to draw our supplies from the widest possible markets in order that those who devise and conduct "corners" shall find their operations the sooner broken. The Government believe in the broadest possible basis of supply, in the policy of abundance, and not of restriction. It seems strange that after last session and the controversy of the last five or six years it should still be necessary to point out the particular individual position of this Kingdom. But if you look through history you will find that the two great industrial marvels of the world are our cotton and shipping industries. Three thousand miles away from its source of supply you will find the greatest cotton industry ever known; £14,000,000 was invested in new mills in Lancashire last year, I am told. It is increasing by leaps and bounds at a time when America with its natural advantages might be expected to beat us. So far it has done nothing of the kind, but once you jeopardise the cause of free trade you jeopardise the prosperity of the cotton industry. I need scarcely refer to our shipping, but as to that we have succeeded in building up the most wonderful shipping industry ever known. It exceeds the total tonnage of the rest of the world, and it is dependent for the first conditions of success on our free trade policy. So successful have we been in fostering exports and imports that they exceed those of the United States, of Germany, or of France, per head of the population, and are still increasing. Surely, in face of these circumstances, the man who would lay his hand on this delicate machinery deserves the reprobation and not the approbation of the country. Our present fiscal system is financially sound, and any departure from it will be commercially and socially unprofitable. Those who will suffer most will be not the rich, but the poor, who already have difficulty enough to endure the ordinary stress of life.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 376; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 167.)

## AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp't
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram,; Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A.C.F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrom)
Gill, A. H.

Gladstone,RtHn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George. Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood,G.(Peterborough
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt.Hon.Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard, B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt,Rt.Hon.Lewis
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harmsworth, R.L (Caithn'ss-sh.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert,T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir;Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson,W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever,W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George,Rt.Hon.David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.R.(Leicester
Macdonald,JM(FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara,Dr.Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna,Rt.Hon.Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren,H.D.(Stafford,W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants
Mansfield,H.Rendall (Lincoln
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G. Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan,G.Hay(Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley,Rt.Hon.John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F.(Notts,Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton,Capt.Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipp'r'ryMid
O'Connor. John (Kildare, N.
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton
Philipps,JWynford(Pembroke
Philipps,Owen C.(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln
Roberts,G.H.(Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson,J.M.(Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson,Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford,V.H.(Brentford)
Samuel,HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw,CharlesEdw.(Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt.Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart,Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor,Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury)
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H(Somerset,E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander

Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W.R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfo'd
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edmd's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Main Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 304; Noes, 54. (Division List No. 168.)

AYES.

**Abraham**, William (Cork, N.E.)
**Acland**, Francis Dyke
**Adkins**, W. Ryland D.
**Agnew**, George William
**Ainsworth**, John Stirling
**Allen**, A. Acland (Christchurch)
**Allen**, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. William (Devonport)
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett E. N.

Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs, Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hn. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L(Caithn'ss-sh)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hohouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St. Pancras, E.
Leese,Sir JosephF.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H.Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson,Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pemb'oke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G. Scott(Bradf'd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E.(Manchester)

Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Waring, Walter
Wason,Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H.W.(Hull,W.)
Wilson,Henry J.(York, W. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson,J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Yoxall, James Henry

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie,H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brace, William
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Cave, George
Clynes, J. R.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Crooks, William
Dalrymple, Viscount
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,Govan
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Hall, Frederick
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hodge, John
Hudson, Walter
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Murphy, John
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorgeD.
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thorne, William
Turnour, Viscount
Walsh, Stephen
Wardle, George J.
Watt, Henry A.
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Arthur Henderson and Mr. George Roberts.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for To-morrow.

### PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

### LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS [STAMP DUTY].

Committee to consider of authorising the imposition of an ad valorem Stamp Duty on contributions by limited partners in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to establish Limited Partnerships (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.)—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

And, it being after half-past Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at four minutes before Twelve o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS.

*Wednesday*, 15th *May*, 1907.

The Viscount Goschen sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Worthing Gas Bill, Read 2ª, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Burnley Corporation Bill; Shanklin Gas Bill; Bristol Corporation Bill; Brighouse Corporation Bill; Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª, and committed.

Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]. Read 3ª; Amendments made; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons.

### ALTON MILITARY HOSPITAL.

Moved, that the order made on the 20th March last "That this House will not receive any petition for a Private Bill later than Thursday, the 2nd day of May next" be dispensed with, and that leave be given to the right hon. Sir William Purdie Treloar, Knight, Lord Mayor of the City of London, to present a petition praying for leave to introduce a Bill "to enable the Alton Military Hospital to be utilised for the purposes of a cripples' college," agreed to. Petition, together with a copy of the proposed Bill annexed thereto, read, and referred to the Examiners.

### PRIVATE AND PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders Nos. 92 and 93 be suspended; and that the time for depositing petitions praying to be heard against Private and Provisional Order Confirmation Bills, also the time for depositing Documents relating to any Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, which would otherwise expire during the adjournment of the House at Whitsuntide be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess.

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill. House in Committee (according to order); Bills reported without Amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bills to be read 3ª To-morrow.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### COMPENSATION FOR INDUSTRIAL DISEASES.

Report of the Departmental Committee on Compensation for Industrial Diseases; Report, minutes of evidence, and appendices.

### TRADE REPORTS, ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3784. United States (Hawaii);

No. 3785. Greece (Trade, etc. of Piræus and district);

No. 3786. Greece (Corfu, Cephalonia, and Zante);

No. 3787. Roumania.

### FISHERIES (SCOTLAND).

Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1906. Part I. General Report.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

### EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN BILL [H.L.].
### PRIZE COURTS BILL [H.L.].

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

### NATURALISATION.

**EARL RUSSELL**: My Lords, I rise to call attention to some incidents of naturalisation in the United Kingdom and in the Colonies, and to ask the Lord Chancellor whether he will introduce legislation with a view to removing doubts as to the effect of naturalisation and anomalies in the *status* of naturalised British subjects.

The Act of 1870, which deals with naturalisation in this country, has certain provisions for effecting the naturalisation of aliens in the United Kingdom, and it contains, among others, a provision, to which I take it there can be no exception, to the effect that the person so naturalised shall be entitled to all the rights, powers and privileges, and so on, to which a natural born British subject is entitled, with this qualification, that he hall not within the limits of the foreign State of which he was a subject be deemed to be a British subject unless he has ceased to be a subject of that State. That avoids what might be unfortunate conflicts between the country of his origin and this country.

But the provision to which I wish to call your Lordships' attention is at the beginning of Section 7, to the effect that an alien who takes advantage of the Naturalisation Act will in the United Kingdom be entitled to all the rights, powers, and privileges, etc. On the face of it such a provision would appear to mean that he is not a British subject anywhere except in the United Kingdom, and the unfortunate person who has taken advantage of that Act is left in considerable uncertainty as to his *status* and nationality. Such a man would be a British subject in the United Kingdom but not in the country of his origin unless a treaty with that country allowed it. He may, and probably would, be a British subject in some other foreign country, but what is the *status* of this unfortunate person in any other part of British Possessions or in our Colonies? Is he a British subject in Australia, or in India; and, if he is not, what is he? That is a position which presents considerable difficulty.

The Acts of most of the Colonies contain similar provisions to the effect that the naturalisation shall only take effect within the limits of the Colony, and that a person naturalised in the Colony acquires the rights of a British subject only within the Colony, a sort of local naturalisation. What his *status* would be elsewhere is not defined. In these days, when we are anxious to draw our Colonies closer, this matter might be set right by some legislation providing that if a man is a British subject here he shall be a British subject throughout the British Empire. It was for the purpose of drawing attention to those anomalies that I placed this Notice on the Paper. It is desirable that the principle of *Civis Romanus sum* should extend throughout the Empire, and I desire to ask the Lord Chancellor whether he will introduce legislation with a view to removing doubts as to the effect of naturalisation and to set right these anomalies in the *status* of naturalised British subjects. I can quite understand that it might not be possible to introduce legislation without consulting the Colonies, but I think the matter is one which should receive immediate attention.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, the Question which the noble Earl has asked relates to a most complicated subject. A study of the laws of marriage and of naturalisation together is enough to drive an ordinary person to distraction. In regard to the question of naturalisation, I admit there are undoubted anomalies such as the noble Earl has referred to. A person naturalised as a British subject within the United Kingdom may, according to some opinions, be considered a British subject all the world over, but if naturalised in one of our Colonies that naturalisation only takes effect within the limits of the area of that particular Colony. That is, of course, a very great anomaly, and is fatal to the idea of unity of citizenship within the British dominions.

Of course, the first and obvious suggestion would be to pass a law authorising naturalisation all over the British dominions to any person naturalised in any part of those dominions. That seems very nice in theory, but in practice it cannot be done. In Australasia, for instance, it has been resolved to have a white Australia, and Australia will not accept the naturalisation of a coloured person naturalised in any other part of the British dominions. And so it is in New Zealand. This is only one of the multitude of difficulties surrounding the question and practically bringing about an *impasse.*

In the circumstances the noble Earl will not be surprised if I say that the Government have no immediate intention of introducing legislation on the subject. I may, however, inform the noble Earl that this matter was brought before the Colonial Conference, and, after some discussion—not very much—during which the difficulties mentioned by the noble Earl were referred to, it was agreed that there should be a subsidiary conference for the purpose of considering the whole of this intricate, difficult question, and to see whether anything could be done in the direction of unifying the laws of naturalisation and common citizenship all over His Majesty's dominions. The matter stands in that position at present. I hope some good may arise from the deliberations of the subsidiary conference, but I can assure the noble Earl that no more thorny question could be imagined than that upon which it is about to embark.

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

**LORD JAMES OF HEREFORD**: My Lords, I should like to ask the noble Earl the President of the Council whether he cannot allow a longer interval before taking the Second Reading of the Bill which he introduced last night enabling women to sit on public bodies. The Bill is down for Second Reading on 30th May, two days after we reassemble, but in view of the importance of the debate that will take place upon it, I think a little longer time should be allowed.

**THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The EARL OF CREWE)**: My Lords, I need not say that I am entirely in the hands of the House in this matter. Although the subject-matter of the Bill is important, it is an exceedingly short Bill; it is by no means of an intricate character, and the points to be debated, although, of course, of great importance, are not numerous. However, if the noble and learned Lord desires to have the Second Reading postponed for a short time, and noble Lords opposite agree with him, I will certainly put it down for a later day.

**THE EARL OF HALSBURY**: Although I quite follow what the noble Earl says as to its being a short Bill, still there is considerable difference of opinion in regard to it, and I think the day proposed for taking the Second Reading is a little too soon after the House reassembles.

**THE EARL OF CREWE**: I will put the Bill down for a later day.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Wednesday, 15th May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

### *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill; Leeds Corporation Bill; London County Council (Money) Bill. Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

### PRIVATE BILLS, &c.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 39, 128, and 230 be suspended, and that the time for depositing Petitions and Memorials against Private Bills, or against any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, and for depositing duplicates of any Documents relating to any Bill to confirm any Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate, also for depositing at the Private Bill Office all Documents relating to any Order under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, be extended to the first day on which the House shall sit after the Recess.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

### MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to regulate and facilitate the increase of the capital of the Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited; and for other purposes." [Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [Lords].

Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

### *PETITIONS.*

### COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition from Wombwell Main, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Langholm, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against: from Bristol; Edgbaston; Enfield; Prestbury; and, Wortham; to lie upon the Table.

### MUNICIPAL MILK DEPOTS BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Wem, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

### PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

### WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.

Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

---

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### FISHERY BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Fishery Board for Scotland, being for the year 1906. Part I., General Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### COMPENSATION FOR INDUSTRIAL DISEASES.

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee on Compensation for Industrial Diseases. Report, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3784 to 3790 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### SINKING FUNDS.

Account presented, of the Commissioners for the reduction of the National Debt, showing the amount received and applied in the year ended 31st March, 1907, in respect of the Old and New Sinking Funds [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 155.]

### PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Temporary Laws, Register of Temporary Laws for the Second Session, Twenty-eighth Parliament, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, pursuant to the Report of the Select Committee on Expiring Laws in session 1866; to be printed. [No. 156.]

### ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

Address for "Return of the Memorandum of the Royal College of Physicians in May, 1905, on Plague."—(*Dr. Rutherford.*)

---

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

### Indian Disturbances—Land Revenue System.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in connection with the recent rioting in the Punjab, said to be due to enhancement of the land tax, he has considered the Report of Mr. S. S. Thorburn, Revenue Commissioner of the Punjab, that in 1891 he found, after a house-to-house investigation of the condition of the peasantry over an area of 1,000 square miles, quite half the old agriculturists already ruined beyond redemption in 126 villages by the system of land revenue administration in force; and whether he can state by how much the land tax of the Punjab has increased since 1891.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I have seen the Report referred to, but I do not gather from it that Mr. Thorburn attributed to the pressure of the land revenue the indebtedness which he found existing in the villages examined by him. On the contrary, he described the assessments made after 1855 as having left a large margin of profit to the owners, thereby raising their credit and facilitating the contraction of debt. Since he reported restrictions have been placed on the power of the transfer of land, and the collection of the land revenue has been made more elastic. In the districts forming the Punjab the land revenue was £1,500,000 in 1891, and is now £1,925,000. The increase is chiefly due to extension of cultivation and irrigation in the canal tracts. In the canal colonies alone nearly 2,000,000 acres have been brought under cultivation since 1891.

### Indian Budget—Issue of Explanatory Memorandum.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE (Inverness Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Memorandum explanatory of the Indian Budget is prepared in India or in London; whether either the document itself or the materials for its preparation have been for some time in the possession of the India Office; and whether, in the future, he will arrange, if it be prepared in India, that it be issued immediately after receipt, or, if it be prepared in London, that it be issued within a reasonable time after receipt of the materials so that there may be allowed, as was done last year, as long an interval as possible for the study of its contents before the discussion on the Indian Budget is taken.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Explanatory Memorandum by the Secretary of State for India is prepared in London. The materials from which it is compiled have been in the possession of the India Office for about one month, within which time the Memorandum (a blue-book of thirty-eight pages) has been prepared and printed. The proof was approved by me on the 8th instant, the earliest date on which the Memorandum has been approved during the twenty-one years since it was first published. I have satisfied myself that its completion at an earlier date cannot reasonably be asked for. It will be in the hands of Members for a considerable period before the Budget discussion.

### Progress of India—Date of Publication of Blue-book.

MR. ANNAN BRYCE: To ask the Secretary of State for India when the speeches made on the Budget in Calcutta, and the annual volume entitled the Moral and Material Progress of India, will be distributed to Members.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I hope that the Budget Statement will be distributed to-morrow, and the Moral and Material Progress Statement by the end of the week.

### Opening up of Trade Route from North East Assam to Sze-chuan.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh. Mid.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is intended to open up negotiations with China for the opening of a trade route along the ancient road from the north-east corner of Assam, via Rima, into the Chinese provinces of Sze-chuan.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Answer is in the negative. The Government of India have no intention of opening up the trade route mentioned.

### Crews of His Majesty's Ships "Mars" and "Hannibal."

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whence the men were drawn to complete the crews of the battleships "Mars" and "Hannibal" of the Devonport Division of the Home Fleet, temporarily replacing the "Commonwealth" and "Dominion" in the Channel Fleet.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The men to complete the crews of the "Mars" and "Hannibal" were drawn from the crews of the "Commonwealth" and "Dominion," respectively.

### Chatham and Sheerness Torpedo Boat Flotilla.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state the age, tonnage, speed, and armament of the torpedo boats forming the torpedo boat flotilla in commission at Sheerness and Chatham; whether any, and which, of them are manned with full crews.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) I regret that I am unable to give the hon. Member the information he asks for, as it would not be in the public interest that the details of our defences in the naval ports should be made public.

### Promotion of Telegraphists at Edinburgh.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in accordance with his wishes that all telegraphists shall, as far as possible, be given equal opportunities to qualify for promotion, he will direct that all fully qualified telegraphists at Edinburgh shall, by a rotary system, be placed on those writing duties the performance of which are held to be necessary qualifications for the position of overseer.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am sorry to be unable to add anything to the Answer I gave to a Question on the same subject which the hon. Member put to me on the 7th instant.†

### Hours of Labour at Deptford Dockyard.

Mr. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, inasmuch as the men employed in His Majesty's dockyards, with the exception of Deptford, are working the same hours all the year through, he will consider the propriety of extending the same principle to the men employed in Deptford Dockyard.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The question of extending this principle to Deptford Victualling Yard was considered at the time, but the lighting arrangements at that yard do not at present render such a course practicable.

Mr. BOWERMAN: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will consider the desirability of granting to the men employed at the Deptford Victualling Yard the same holiday as is granted to the men employed at Woolwich Arsenal and the Army Clothing Factory at Pimlico on the occasion of His Majesty's birthday.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) It is not desirable that the practice at Deptford Victualling Yard, with regard to the observance of His Majesty's birthday, should differ from that adopted in other naval establishments in the United Kingdom.

Mr. BOWERMAN: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that the Lords of the Admiralty have visited all His Majesty's dockyards with the exception of Deptford, it is the intention of their Lordships to pay a visit to that dockyard; or, failing such visit, will the Admiralty be prepared to receive a deputation from the men employed in Deptford Dockyard.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Deptford is no longer included amongst the royal dockyards, and the Board of Admiralty officially visit only the great dockyard establishments for the purpose of hearing petitions.

### Sanitary Condition of Post Offices in the City of London.

Mr. MYER (Lambeth, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether during the early part of the year a Home Office official was deputed to make an inspection of various post offices in the City of London, with respect to their sanitary condition; and, if so, whether his Report is now ready for publication.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) In January last, at the request of my right hon. friend the Postmaster-General, I instructed one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Factories to inspect and report upon certain post offices in the City of London. His Report was transmitted to the Postmaster-General last month. It is for the Postmaster-General to decide what subsequent steps shall be taken.

### Irish Solicitors' Licence Duty.

Mr. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can say whether he has received a copy of a resolution from the Northern Law Society in Ireland protesting against the continuance of the licence duty payable by solicitors in Ireland; if so, whether it is his intention to abolish this tax; and, if not, why.

Mr. O'DOHERTY: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can say whether he has received a memorial from the council of the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland, praying that the annual duties payable by solicitors in Ireland, under the provisions of the Stamp Act of 1891, be abolished from and after the 5th day of January, 1908; and whether he proposes to take steps to do so.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if his attention has been called to a resolution from the Northern Law Society of Ireland praying for the abolition of the licence duty payable by solicitors; and, if so, will he consider the advisability of removing this tax which is not paid by any other profession.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 204.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I have received the memorial and the resolution referred to, and I have given careful consideration to the arguments advanced in favour of the abolition of this licence duty. Nothing has, however, been urged against the duty which is not in my opinion equally applicable to many other licence duties of a more or less similar character, nor is there any sufficient reason for treating Ireland differently as regards this matter from other portions of the United Kingdom. I do not, therefore, see my way to taking any steps unless and until an opportunity arises of revising local taxation licences as a whole.

### Irish Council Bill—Income of the Eight Departments.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the present annual income of the eight Departments proposed to be dealt with in his Irish Council Bill under the heads of endowment, interest on invested capital, Parliamentary grants, and Exchequer contribution, and any other sources.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) A Return which I intend shortly to lay upon the Table will include the information asked for.

### Irish Council Bill—Electoral Divisions.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will say whether the proposed distribution of electoral divisions given in Schedule 1 of the Irish Councils Bill is made on the basis of population.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) In fixing the number of members for each of the counties and county boroughs regard was had, so far as possible, to the respective populations.

### Salmon Fisheries in Scotland—Public and Private Fishing Rights.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can give the names of the lochs, rivers, and burns in which salmon fishing takes place in Scotland and which are still the property of the Woods and Forests Department, the number of such that are let for private fishing, and the number over which anglers in general have a right to fish.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am unable to give particulars of all the inland lochs, rivers, and burns in Scotland in which fishing for salmon takes place, and as to which the right to fish might on full investigation be found to be the property of the Crown, but the particulars of the lochs, rivers, and burns as to which the Crown's title to salmon fishings has been admitted, and which are let, are as follows:—Aberdeenshire: parts of Rivers Don, Dee, Ythan, and Fourdoun Burn; Berwickshire: parts of Rivers Whitadder and Blackadder; Dumfriesshire: parts of River Cairn and Dalwhat Water; Fifeshire: part of River Eden; Forfarshire: part of River Isla; Inverness-shire: parts of Rivers Morar and Caime and various small streams and lochs in the parish of Glenelg; Perthshire: parts of Rivers Teith and Allan; Ross shire: part of River Allness. The number of lettings in force is seventeen, and in two cases the lessees are under terms to grant licences to fish to the public. With these two exceptions lettings are for private fishing. The fishings are in most cases of very little value and the rents, with a few exceptions, nominal. There are no cases in which anglers in general have a right to fish for salmon.

### Whisky Frauds in Ireland—Arrest of the Secretary of D. E. Williams, Limited.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that in the case of the Crown against D. E. Williams, Limited, of Tullamore, judgment has been marked against the secretary of the company as well as against the company itself for the sum of £65,000 in respect of cumulated penalties incurred for irregularities under the Spirits Act of 1880; whether he is aware that the secretary, a mere employee of the company and dependent solely upon the salary he received, has been placed under arrest and lodged in Tullamore Gaol, and still detained there, on a warrant issued by the sheriff of King's County for failing to satisfy the judgment; and whether having regard to the inability of this secretary to satisfy the judgment debt for £65,000, the present intentions of the Crown as regards him can be made known.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The gentleman in question was released on Monday the 13th instant.

### Miscellaneous Revenue.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state, outside the ordinary sources of Revenue, Customs, Excise, and Post Office, what has been the average annual amount of miscellaneous revenue for the last ten years; and whether it has been applied to Irish purposes, or how it has been otherwise expended.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The amounts derived each year from Ireland under the head of "Miscellaneous Revenue" are shown in the annual Financial Relations Returns. The average amount during the last ten years has been approximately £120,000. These receipts are paid into the Exchequer and applied in meeting the charges on the Exchequer, including the charge for Irish services.

### Irish Quit Rents.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what is the total amount of accumulated funds derived from quit rents in Ireland; how much was collected last year and how it has been expended; and whether the Government will consider the advisability of distributing this Irish money amongst the county councils of Ireland in aid of reafforestation according to the needs and capabilities of each county.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) It cannot be said that there are any accumulated funds derived from quit rents in Ireland. As the hon. Member has been informed on several occasions, the surplus annual income from that source is annually paid into the Exchequer, as provided by the Crown Lands Acts, and goes in relief of general taxation in the United Kingdom, and the proceeds of the sale of quit rents have, under the same Acts, become merged in the capital of the land revenues of the Crown, which is invested in land in Great Britain and Ireland and in British and Irish stocks. The amount collected in 1906–7 was £31,251. This money is not by law available for the purposes mentioned in the Question.

### Roscrea District Council Loan.

Mr. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Inland Revenue officer at Dublin has applied to the Roscrea No. 1 Rural District Council for payment of loan capital duty, at the rate of 2s. 6d. per cent. on a recent loan obtained by the council from the Irish Land Commission, under the Labourers Acts; will he say if this is the first application of the kind in Ireland, and if it is proposed to assess this duty on all future loans under the Acts mentioned; whether he is aware that there are 25,000 cottages to be built during the current year in Ireland, under improvement schemes now in the course of preparation; that each cottage will cost about £200; and that the loan capital duty (if assessed) will entail an unexpected expenditure, under these Acts, of more than £6,000 in respect of this duty alone; and, having regard to the provisions of the Labourers Act of last session, providing for the remission of stamp duty, he will arrange that this duty will not be assessed.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) A claim for loan capital duty has been made as described. It is one of several, twenty-four in all, of which eighteen have been settled by recognition of the claim by the district councils concerned. Section 23 of The Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1906, which exempts from stamp duty agreements and certain other instruments, has no application to loans effected by district councils for purposes of the Act; and, under the law as it stands, neither the Board of Inland Revenue nor the Treasury has power to refrain from assessing the loan capital duty.

### Armagh District Council Loan—Delay in Sanction.

Mr. LONSDALE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain the delay on the part of the Local Government

Board in sanctioning the loan in connection with the Armagh Rural District Council's No. 1 Labourers Scheme; whether he is aware that the labourers interested in this scheme are suffering much hardship owing to the want of proper accommodation; and whether he will impress upon the Local Government Board the necessity of dealing with this matter at once, so that the rural district council can proceed with the construction of the cottages.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have sanctioned the loan in this case, and the district council were so informed on the 8th instant. The delay in the case was due to correspondence with the council with a view to a reduction of the loan applied for, which was at the unusually high rate of £228 for each cottage and plot.

### New Irish Council—Cost of General Election.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can inform the House of the approximate cost of a general election to the proposed Irish Council; and whether such charges will fall upon the ratepayers or upon the proposed Irish Exchequer.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It is assumed that £25,000 will cover the cost of the election. Under the Bill the cost of the first election will be provided by Parliament. The charge for subsequent elections will fall upon the Irish Exchequer.

### Irish Council—Incomes of Departments.

MR. GEORGE CLARK (Belfast, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant a Return stating the incomes enjoyed by the departments and authorities mentioned in Clause 2 (1), and in Schedule 3 of the Irish Council Bill, apart from moneys voted to them annually by Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I propose to lay upon the Table a Return which will contain, among other things, the information asked for in the Question.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Mr. Timothy O'Callaghan.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have yet taken any steps towards the reinstatement of Mr. Timothy O'Callaghan on the Newman estate, Dromahane, Mallow, County Cork; is he aware that, in consenting, at the landlord's solicitation, to exclude this tenant from the general sale to the tenants, although Mr. O'Callaghan was willing to purchase upon the same terms as his fellow tenants, upon the alleged ground that the landlords would, upon the expiry of the tenant's judicial term, seek to resume possession of the holding, the Commissioners acted *ultra vires*, inasmuch as this tenant was a judicial tenant, and, as such, entitled to apply to have a fair rent fixed for another statutory term of fifteen years on the expiration of the current term; whether he is aware that these facts were brought under the notice of the Commissioners, whilst purchase negotiations were proceeding, by O'Callaghan's solicitor and by the Member for the division (North Cork), and that, pending the correspondence with the Commissioners and Parliamentary inquiry respecting this man's exclusion from the purchase scheme, rent accrued, for the non-payment of which he was evicted from his holding; and whether, in view of the fact that it is now decided that a judicial tenant cannot now be excluded on the grounds herein set forth, the Commissioners will make a special effort to procure this man's reinstatement.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have endeavoured to effect the reinstatement of Mr. O'Callaghan in his former holding, but have not succeeded in doing so. They have, however, informed him that his case will be considered in connection with the distribution of any untenanted land which the Commissioners may acquire in the county. The Commissioners are not aware of any legal decision which would go to show that their action in allowing the sale of the estate to be concluded without the inclusion of O'Callaghan's holding was *ultra vires*. O'Callaghan was evicted in consequence of his refusing to pay rent after his holding had been omitted from the sale and the advances had been made in respect of the other holdings.

### Telephone from Tralee Police Barracks.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Royal Irish Constabulary authorities have received a communication from the Tralee Urban Council in reference to the necessity of connecting the Tralee police barracks with the local telephone system; whether the constabulary authorities, if such a connection were established, would be prepared to pay the annual rent; and, if so, will he take steps to have this connection established.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Inspector-General informs me that he has received from the Tralee Urban Council a communication to the effect stated, but is unable to adopt the suggestion of the council. No provision for such expenditure is made in the Vote for the Constabulary.

### Irish Council — Administrative Action and Sanction of the Lord-Lieutenant.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if it is proposed to permit the Irish Council to perform any administrative function without their having previously submitted the intended course of action in the form of a resolution to the Lord-Lieutenant, or whether the Council will be empowered to act, if they so choose, without reference to the Lord-Lieutenant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I beg to refer the noble Lord to Clause 21 (2) of the Bill.

### Cession of part of Swaziland to the Transvaal.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any negotiations are taking place with the view of ceding some portion of Swaziland to the Transvaal Government; and whether, before any definite decision is arrived at, the House will be fully advised and consulted on the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) No such negotiations are in progress.

### Revenue and Expenditure for Ireland.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will state the approximate true revenue and expenditure for Ireland during each of the last twenty years, and the approximate annual amount of this expenditure spent on material imported into Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The figures of Irish revenue and expenditure are shown in the annual Financial Relations Returns. I have no information as to the amount expended on material imported into Ireland.

### Civil Service Higher Appointments.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will give a list of the number of cases which have occurred during the last five years in which heads of departments have recommended for the higher posts under their control experienced men risen from the ranks, whilst the Treasury opposed such recommendations on the ground that these higher posts should be filled by men successful in the Higher Division open competitions; and whether he will state in how many cases did the Treasury view prevail.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am not aware of any such cases. But I cannot undertake to have a search made through the Treasury correspondence of the last five years.

### Appointments in the Surveying Department of the Post Office.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether some short time ago correspondence passed between the Treasury and the Post Office on the question of appointments in the surveying department of the Post Office; whether the Post Office put forward the view that these posts should be filled by men risen from the ranks and experienced in Post Office work, and the Treasury persisted in the view that these posts should be given to inexperienced young men successful in Higher Division open competitions; and whether he will state the ultimate arrangement which was decided on.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) There is no fixed rule as to the manner in which these appointments should be filled, and, so far as I am aware, there is no difference of opinion on the subject between the two Departments.

### Surpluses Surrendered from Irish Votes.

MR. FIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can have a Return prepared showing the surpluses from Irish Votes surrendered to the Treasury since the passing of the Land Act, 1903, and setting forth the effect of the finance provisions of the said Act; and what would be their effect if those savings were placed against the losses of the Treasury instead of being used in the reduction of the National Debt.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have already explained, in answer to the hon. Member's Question on the 2nd instant, that the mere fact of the expenditure on a voted service being less than it has been estimated to be does not necessarily ensure that any money is thereby set free for application to another purpose. I do not think that any useful purpose would be served by instituting a comparison between the savings on Irish Votes and the deficiencies on the Irish Land Purchase Fund.

### Increase on Customs Estimate due to Increase of Salaries.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how much of the net increment of £6,000 in the Estimates for Customs is due to increments of salary; how many officers have received an increase of salary, and the amount by which the salary of each official has been increased; and the number of officers whose salaries have not been affected by the revision effected under the Estimate.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I find that the preparation of the information required by the hon. Member, so far as it is not available from the published volume of the Estimates, would take a far greater amount of time and labour than I feel justified in authorising, but the Board of Customs inform me that they will be happy to furnish the hon. Member with any particulars regarding individual officers which can be properly and readily given.

### Post Office Savings Bank—Unclaimed Balances.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General what is the amount approximately of the unclaimed balances in the books of the Post Office Savings Bank; when was the last account of these unclaimed balances presented to the public; and whether, having regard to the amount of money unclaimed and never likely to be claimed in Post Office investments, any, and, if so, what plan has been made for its disposition to the public use.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton*). The approximate total of the unclaimed balances standing to the credit of depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank could only be ascertained by a detailed examination of the ledgers, and I do not think the result would justify the labour and expense involved. No account of these balances has been published, and I am not prepared to sanction the compilation of such an account. The bank may at any time be called upon to discharge its liability in respects of deposits; and it frequently happens that a demand for repayment is made after an account has remained untouched for a considerable period.

### Metropolitan Water Board and Treatment of the Staff.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the Metropolitan Water Board are endeavouring to evade the provisions of Section 47, Sub-section 1, of The Metropolis Water Act, 1902, by forcing their transferred officers and servants to sign away their rights and privileges granted them by that Act under threat of not granting them any increase of salary or wages unless they do so; is he aware that Lord Balfour, the chairman of the Joint Select Committee, stated that the Committee's desire would be to put them in absolutely the position which, as reasonable men, they might reasonably look forward to if there had been no such Bill as this, which was endorsed by the counsel to the Local Government Board, the promoters of the Bill; whether he has any jurisdiction in the matter; and, if not, whether he will consider the advisability of introducing in any similar Bills in the future a right of appeal by the parties concerned to the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have made inquiry on this subject and am informed that, where an officer transferred from one of the water companies to the Water Board is promoted to a higher office or greater emoluments than he was entitled to under the terms of his service with the company, the Water Board impose a condition that the advantages given to him shall not at some future time be made a ground for claiming also additional superannuation, or like allowance, to which he would not have been entitled under the terms of his service with the company. I am aware of the statements which were by Lord Balfour and by the counsel for the Local Government Board on the Bill for the Act of 1902, and which are referred to in the Question, but I find that the Water Board do not regard their action as forcing the transferred officers and servants to sign away their rights and privileges under the Act. I have no jurisdiction in the matter; but I will note the suggestion of the hon. Member.

### Payment of Vaccination Officers.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will make provision by a Vaccination Order for the payment of a fee to the vaccination officer for registering the certificates proposed in his Bill, or abolish the payments by fee to the vaccination officer and provide for him to receive a fixed income based upon his average income for the five years previous to the Bill becoming law.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am not aware of any sufficient reason for adopting the course suggested.

### Construction of Workhouses and Infirmaries.

SIR WILLIAM BULL: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Board some years ago issued a code of suggestions and instructions for the guidance of boards of guardians as to the mode of constructing workhouses and infirmaries for Poor Law purposes; what is the date of the last edition of the code; and whether in that code or in any other official publication, any suggestions have been issued for the guidance of guardians as to the best mode of equipping these institutions with electricity for lighting and power purposes.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Board some years ago issued a memorandum as to the points to be attended to in the construction of workhouse buildings, and extracts from it with certain alterations have continued to be issued. The last material alterations were made in 1897. A memorandum on the construction of Poor Law infirmaries was issued in October last. The Answer to the last part of the Question is in the negative.

### Charges for Certificates of Birth.

MR. W. JOHNSON (Warickshire, Nuneaton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware that the sum of 2s. 7d. is charged for certificates of birth by superintendent registrars and registrars of birth, whereas under Section 134 of the Factory and Workshops Act, 1904, only 6d. should be the fee, owing to the applicants, who are very poor people, being in ignorance that they can obtain a requisition form free of charge from registrars and superintendent registrars of births; whether he will issue an order making it compulsory that registrars and superintendent registrars of births shall on every application for such certificates point out to the applicant that such a form is necessary and offer the said form to the applicants; and whether he will confer with the Secretary of State for the Home Department as to the inspectors of factories assisting the Local Government Board to prevent the imposition of such a charge upon applicants for certificates.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Where application is made to a superintendent registrar or registrar, and properly verified, for a certificate of the birth of any young person or child which is required for any of the purposes of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, or for any purpose connected with the employment in labour or elementary education of the young person or child, the officer is bound by the regulations in force to furnish the applicant with a cheap certificate costing 6d. instead of the usual fee of 3s. 7d. I understand from the Registrar-General that he has no reason to suppose that the officers do not act in accordance with the spirit and intention of the Act and regulations, but if any particular case to the contrary is brought to his notice he will cause inquiry to be made into it. It does not at present appear to me to be necessary to take further action in the matter.

### Local Government Board Messengers.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board how many appointments have been made in the Local Government Board to permanent messengerships since January, 1906; and what was the occupation of the individual men prior to appointment.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) One appointment has been made. The person appointed was previously in domestic service.

### Midland Railway—Running Engines Tender First.

SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that on certain portions of the Midland Railway a practice has been adopted of engine-drivers taking trains to points between thirty and forty miles distant and returning to the point from which they started with the tender first, instead of proceeding to the nearest station where a turntable is available; and whether, in view of the repeated comments of Board of Trade inspectors as to the increased risks involved in running engines tender first, he will make a representation to the company on this matter.

(*Answered by Mr Lloyd-George.*) I will communicate with the railway company in this matter, and subsequently inform my hon. friend of the result.

### Discipline of Customs Officers.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been directed to the fact that in the rules relating to discipline of officers of his Majesty's Customs, Rule 30 in the Abstracts of Regulations of 1905, whereby superior officers are prohibited from undertaking to collect or promoting a collection of subscriptions for any purpose whatever among the officers of a lower grade is omitted from the Abstracts of Regulations of 1907; what has been the reason of this omission and under what circumstances has this rule been abrogated; and whether, having regard to the practically enforced subscriptions by subordinate officials to testimonials promoted and encouraged by official superiors, the old rule prohibiting the promotion of the collection of subscriptions by superior officers amongst officers of a lower grade will be restored and enforced.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The Abstracts of Regulations referred to appear to be those contained in "Ham's Customs Year Book," an unofficial publication for which the Board of Customs are in no way responsible. The rule against superior officers collecting or promoting the collection of subscriptions among their subordinates, which has been in force for about half a century, remains unaltered, and the Board have no reason to believe but that it has been faithfully observed. They would rigidly enforce the observance of the rule if any breach of it were brought to their notice.

### Irish Land Stock.

MR. WALKER (Leicestershire, Melton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the fact that the stock created under the Irish Land Act of 1903 is commonly quoted in the Press as Irish Land Stock; and whether, seeing that an erroneous impression would appear, from the price at which the stock stands, to have been engendered thereby that its security has some relation to the value of Irish land, he will signify the desire of His Majesty's Treasury that this stock should, in accordance with the terms of this Act, be entitled Guaranteed $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Stock.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) My hon. friend correctly states the statutory title of the stock. Writers in the Press presumably make use of the title which they find most convenient. They cannot be denied that freedom; but his Question will, perhaps, call attention to the more accurate description.

### Payment of Indian Officers on Leave in England.

SIR SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for

India why the privilege granted to officers on combined leaves under civil leave rules of drawing their privilege pay at the Home Treasury has not been extended to military officers generally; and whether he will consider the advisability of granting this concession.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The officers to whom the concession was granted draw their leave pay in arrear, but officers on combined leave under military leave rules draw the whole of their privilege leave pay in advance on leaving India. I do not see, therefore, that the concession would be of any value to them.

### Support of Michael Nealon, an ex-Army Man.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received a copy of a resolution from the Newcastle West Board of Guardians, in the county of Limerick, protesting against having to support out of the rates Michael Nealon, a retired Army man, who is apparently suffering from a gun-shot wound; and whether he intends to relieve the ratepayers of the union of this charge.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A copy of the resolution has been received, and the case shall be investigated as soon as the necessary particulars are known.

### Minimum Staff at Woolwich.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state what is to be the minimum staff retained at the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is not possible at present to give this information.

### Pay and Position of Civil Engineers, Architects, etc., on Army Staff.

MR. GODFREY BARING (Isle of Wight): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that there is a body of civil engineers, architects, and surveyors on the Staff of the Army, fifty-eight in number, whose position, pay, and prospects have been the subject of three different Committees; and whether he can say if, and when, effect will be given to the recommendations of those Committees.

MR. GODFREY BARING: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that there are on the Staff qualified civil engineers who will, owing to stoppage in their promotion which has been made since their entrance into the public service, remain stationary at a salary of £280 per annum until they are over sixty years of age; and whether it is intended to allow this state of things to continue.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) These Questions presumably refer to the surveyors on the Royal Engineer Civil Staff. A scheme has been for some time under consideration by which the prospects of these gentlemen will be improved; and it is hoped that it will be possible to obtain a final decision at an early date.

### Pay of Special Reservists.

VISCOUNT MORPETH (Birmingham, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for War if the special reservists will be paid at the rate now paid to the first-class Army Reserve; and, if not, on what scale will the payment be made.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is proposed that the pay of the special contingent when called up for training shall be on the scale of that of the Regular Army, and that their reserve pay shall approximate to the bounties now given to the Militia.

---

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Alton Military Hospital.

MR. W. NICHOLSON (Hampshire, Petersfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that the hospital at Alton, Hants, which was presented to the War Office by the subscribers to the Daily Mail Fund during the South African War, is no longer in use as an Army hospital; if he can state the reasons why the hospital has been closed; and if it is the intention of the War Office to dispose of it by sale.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden): My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this. This hospital is no longer in use as an Army hospital as there is ample accommodation in the other Army hospitals at Aldershot. It is not at present proposed to dispose of the building by sale.

### Plague in India.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India the number of deaths from plague in India during April, 1907, and the total number from September, 1896.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The figures are:—for April, 1907, deaths from plague 314,000; from September, 1896, to end of April, 1907, 5,326,000 approximately.

### Unrest in India.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will give the House the names of those who have been arrested and imprisoned without trial in India, the period of their detention, the charges upon which they are confined, and which of them, if any, have been released; and whether he proposes to release the others in accordance with the provisions of the Act of Habeas Corpus.

MR. MORLEY: It would be impossible, without long inquiry, to give the names of all the persons who during the last eighty-nine years have been arrested and imprisoned under the Regulations of 1818, 1819, and 1827. The persons now in prison are ten in number, of whom five are not British subjects, and four are Moplahs indicated in the Moplah outbreak in 1894. If my hon. friend will come to my room presently, I will give him the list of names. I gave, on Monday, the considerations which prevented His Majesty's Government from repealing or annulling those Regulations; the same considerations prevent me from ordering the release of any of the persons now imprisoned under them.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): Is it not the fact that the Habeas Corpus Act is suspended over all India, or at least in some of the provinces?

MR. MORLEY: There is no suspension of the Act beyond the implied suspension under the Regulations I have mentioned.

MR. O'GRADY: Is there any truth in the statement that bodies of stalwart rustics armed with bludgeons are moving into Lahore? If so, what is the reason and why are they gathered in this manner. Has this statement anything to do with the large number of troops despatched to Lahore? And may I ask whether the Government intend to prevent such misleading statements being supplied to the Press at home by a well-known agency?

MR MORLEY: I have received no official information with regard to the very striking allegation as to the stalwart rustics mentioned by my hon. friend. The statement published has no connection with the large number of troops despatched to Lahore. That was a proceeding taken on grounds of its own. When my hon. friend asks me whether I intend to prevent misleading statements being supplied to the Press, I should have thought he was the last man to invite me to take up the duty of Press censor. At the same time, I agree that it is deplorable that wild rumours, for many of which there is no foundation whatever, are so freely and disadvantageously circulated.

MR. O'GRADY: Does not the right hon. Gentleman think it desirable, in view of the grave state of unrest in India, that a certain agency should be muzzled?

MR. MORLEY: I feel sure that if I were, under the Regulation of 1818, to muzzle an agency in India and to try to muzzle it in this country, my hon. friend would be the first to complain.

### Cotton Growing in British East Africa.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the directors of the British East Africa Corporation, Limited, state, in a prospectus issued to the public in February last, that they will operate an annual grant of £1,000 from the British East Africa Government, that they will work lands specially conceded by the Government, that the British Cotton Growing Association has subscribed for 10,000 shares at par in the capital of their company, and that their general manager in East Africa is Major E. H. M. Leggett, D.S.O., R.E.; whether this Major Leggett is a Government official; and whether the House will have an opportunity of considering these Government grants of money and lands to a private company.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The Secretary of State has seen the prospectus to which the hon. Member refers. As I explained on the 8th inst. in my reply to the question of the hon. Member for Rye, the British East Africa Corporation is merely employed by the British Cotton Growing Association to carry out the experimental work which the Association has undertaken to do for the Government under stringent conditions, in consideration of a grant of £1,000 per annum for three years from the funds of the East Africa Protectorate. Major Leggett is a Royal Engineer officer of special attainments whose services have been lent to the Corporation, at the request of the British Cotton Growing Association, for three years, during which period he will draw no pay from public funds. The grant of money to the British Cotton Growing Association and of land to the Corporation can be discussed on the Vote for Colonial Services, which includes a grant in aid of the revenue of the East Africa Protectorate.

MR. BOWLES: Am I to understand that the statements in this prospectus that the British East Africa Corporation themselves operate a Government grant of £1,000 a year and lands specially conceded to them by the Government are inaccurate?

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes; our dealings are with the British Cotton Growing Association, which we are endeavouring to further in all parts of the British Empire. So far as the East Africa Corporation are concerned, they are only concerned indirectly and through the British Cotton Growing Association.

MR. BOWLES: If the Government grant of £1,000 granted to one body for experimental purposes is being used by another body, which is a private company, for its own purposes, will the right hon. gentleman reconsider the circumstances under which that grant was made?

MR. CHURCHILL: No; I think the grant is being applied so as to give the greatest possible effect to the purposes to which we, after much consideration, devoted the money.

## Swaziland.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, with regard to proposals for the throwing open of Swaziland to prospectors, whether any change in the Swaziland Order in Council of December last is contemplated, or any interference with the direct control of the Crown over Swaziland or with the arrangements on behalf of the natives, and extended reservation of native lands, announced by him in connection with the grant of the Transvaal constitution.

MR. CHURCHILL: No amendment of the Order in Council is at present in contemplation nor any alteration in the general policy of His Majesty's Government with regard to Swaziland.

## Transvaal Government and Coolie Labour.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Home Government have yet received any information from the new Transvaal Government regarding the date it is intended finally to dispense with Chinese indentured labour in the mines; whether the cost of repatriating those coolies who in the future consider the terms of indentured labour to be tantamount to slavery will be borne by the Home Government or the Transvaal; and can he state the numbers repatriated under this head before and subsequent to the granting of the new Transvaal Constitution.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is undesirable to anticipate the declarations of policy which will, I understand, shortly be made to the Transvaal Parliament by the responsible Government of that Colony. The repatriation notice is still in force for the present, and the expenses incurred under it, if any, will continue to be paid by his Majesty's Government. The number of repatriations under the notice is 766, all of whom were sent to China before the new Constitution came into force.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked if those 766 went back because they considered the conditions of labour were tantamount to slavery?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir. They are returned under the heading of those who were dissatisfied with the conditions of employment and had not the means themselves to return home.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked if there had been any repatriations since the new Transvaal Government came into power.

MR. CHURCHILL: None that I know of.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): In view of the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that it is undesirable to anticipate declarations of policy to be made in the Transvaal Parliament, are we to understand that he knows what action is going to be taken there?

MR. CHURCHILL: Certainly not. The hon. Gentleman must not understand anything of the kind. I was endeavouring to discourage speculations of an idle character.

### The Imperial Conference.

MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough) asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he could confirm or deny the statement that at the previous day's Imperial Conference an incident occurred which caused Sir Robert Bond to leave the room in indignation, complaining that gross humiliation had been inflicted on him and on the Colony he represented.

MR. CHURCHILL: My attention has been drawn to a report, in to-day's *Daily Mail*, of the proceedings at the Conference yesterday. I cannot undertake, as a general rule, to correct misstatements appearing in journals of that class and character; but as I learn that this particular report has been cabled fully to the Colonies, it has become necessary for me to say that it is from beginning to end a baseless and impudent fabrication, which bears not the slightest resemblance in substance or form to anything that took place at the Colonial Conference. And I will further permit myself to observe that it is a matter of surprise to me that a person who has lately been created a Peer of the realm should be willing to allow newspapers under his control to employ, for political objects, methods of such transparent mendacity.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: Has not the right hon. Gentleman seen the statements with regard to India which are equally false?

[No Answer was returned.]

### New Transvaal Loan.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies on what date the guarantee of the new Transvaal loan was promised to General Botha.

MR. CHURCHILL: The date was 4th May.

### General Botha and the Chinese Coolies.

MR. LANE-FOX: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any arrangement has been come to with General Botha as to the complete repatriation of the Chinese coolies from the Transvaal; and, if so, what was the date of such arrangement.

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, but the Prime Minister of the Transvaal, will, I understand, make a statement as to the policy of his Government in his own Parliament at a fitting moment.

### Morocco.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Andrews Burghs, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information with regard to the present state of affairs in Morocco; and whether any steps are being taken to protect the British residents there.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir EDWARD GREY): It is presumed that the hon. Member refers more especially to the state of affairs at Morocco City, where some of the tribes are reported to have assumed a hostile attitude towards their own authorities. There has been no mention, so far, of any attacks being directed against Europeans. But my right hon. friend is informed by His Majesty's Minister at Tangier that the British residents were to leave Morocco City on the 9th instant for a less disturbed part.

### Mr. Abbott's Ransom.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): On behalf of the hon. Member for the St. Andrews Burghs, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what reply he has had from the Turkish Government to his request for the repayment of the £15,000 ransom paid to the brigands for the release of Mr. Abbott; and whether he will ask for compensation from the Turkish Government for this gentleman.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No reply has yet been received from the Ottoman Government to the request which has been addressed to them for the reimbursement of the sum advanced for Mr. Abbott's ransom. With regard to the question of compensation, my right hon. friend has nothing to add to the statement which he made to the hon. Member on the 2nd instant.† Our demand is, as on previous occasions, for the repayment of the sum actually expended.

### Labour on the Panama Canal.

MR. JOHN WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information as to the number of emigrants from British Possessions now working upon the Panama Canal; whether he has any information as to the rate of sickness and mortality among such emigrants; what powers he possesses to enforce the terms of contracts under which such emigrants engaged; and whether His Majesty has any representative upon the canal to whom British subjects may appeal in case of necessity or grievance.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The exact number of emigrants from British Possessions working on the canal is not known. But the immigrants into Panama from the British West Indies during 1906 amounted to 24,400, presumably including women and children. In September last there were at work in the engineering department and earthworks of the canal over 10,000 men from these islands. If this information is not sufficient, a report will be called for from His Majesty's representative at Panama. The daily sick-rate for the first ten months of 1906 was twenty-eight per thousand; the annual death-rate 44·03 per thousand. These figures apply, however, to the whole body of canal labourers, and there is no special information as regards those from British Possessions. His Majesty's Government have no special powers to enforce the terms of the labourers' contracts. But in the event of a case of non-fulfilment of a contract being brought to their notice and warranting action on their part, a diplomatic representation could, of course, be addressed to the United States Government, as the employer. His Majesty's Representative at Panama, to whom all complaints made by British subjects are addressed, has, however, reported that any recent complaints made to him have been so few and trivial that he has generally found on investigation that they had no foundation. He is convinced that the labourers are well treated and well cared for.

MR. J. WARD: Do I understand it is intended to ask for a special report?

MR. RUNCIMAN: If the hon. Member so desires.

MR. J. WARD: I certainly do.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Is it not the case that extraordinary precautions have been taken by the United States Government to prevent sickness, and that the sanitary state of the workmen is good?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I think it would be better to wait for a fuller report; but I understand that generally what the noble Lord states is accurate.

### Cost of the Consular Service.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will explain the developments of the Consular

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 1061–2.

Service which involve an increase of £15,484 in the Estimate for that service.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The total increase in salaries and allowances is £8,767. This is principally due to the creation of new Consular posts, the increased cost of living in all parts of the world, the rise in the value of the Mexican dollar in China, and the additional duties thrown upon Consular Officers, which involve the employment of more clerks in the various Consulates.

### Consols.

MR. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can give the exact amount of 2½ per cent. Consols on 13th May, 1907, and the amount on the same Monday in 1906.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend has asked me to say that the exact amount of Consols on Monday, 13th May, 1907, was £583,177,773 5s. 2d., and on Monday, 14th May, 1906, £585,053,842 19s. 9d.

### Civil Servants' Pensions.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what steps he proposes to take to carry out the recommendation of the Departmental Committee that military service should be included in assessing the pensions payable to Civil Servants who have served in the Navy or in the Army.

MR. RUNCIMAN: This question has been carefully reviewed by the last and the present Board of Treasury and they have both come to the conclusion that, having regard to the dissimilarity of the conditions affecting appointment, promotion, pay, and pension in the Army and Navy on the one hand, and in the Civil Service on the other, there is insufficient ground for asking Parliament to modify the present practice.

### Income-Tax.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state, so far as available materials enable him to estimate, what is the aggregate value of the incomes subject to income-tax between the limits £160–£700 and £700–£2,000, respectively.

MR. RUNCIMAN: It is possible, from the information obtained through claims for abatement, to estimate with approximate accuracy the aggregate of incomes lying between £160 and £700, and the amount (before deduction or abatements and allowances on life premiums) may be put at about £275,000,000. No similar *data* are available in respect of incomes between £700 and £2,000, and any estimate of the aggregate amount of such incomes must be exceedingly speculative. It is thought at Somerset House that it may, perhaps, be guessed to be about £150,000,000.

### London Police and Public Meetings.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many inspectors, sergeants, and constables of the Metropolitan police, and how many horses, were deprived of their Sunday rest on 12th May by the demonstration in Hyde Park; what was the cost to the ratepayers in travelling and allowances for such police; and, having in view the constant recurrence of such employment on the Sabbath, will he consider the propriety of requiring the promoters of such Sunday gatherings being called upon to indemnify the public for such expenses, in like manner as the organisers of any other form of public entertainment or recreation.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): Twenty-two Inspectors, thirty-six sergeants and 151 constables who would otherwise have been enjoying their fortnightly leave day were necessarily employed on Sunday the 12th instant. Each will receive a day's leave in exchange for the one thus lost. Fifty-five horses were also employed. They were drawn as far as possible from neighbouring divisions and the cost therefore is estimated not to exceed £15 for travelling, etc. I am afraid I cannot take any steps in the direction indicated in the last part of the hon. and gallant Member's Question.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Can the right hon. Gentleman do nothing to limit the number of these extraordinary demonstrations which occupy the streets, employ a large number of police, and cause great inconvenience to the public?

MR. J. WARD asked if his right hon. friend would also take into consideration the extraordinary expense and inconvenience caused to the police in regulating tariff reform meetings on Sunday afternoons?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Are there any tariff reform meetings on Sunday afternoons?

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): And has he any information as to the cost of the police at the Moderate meeting in Trafalgar Square, where they paid 4s. per. head?

MR. J. WARD: Where they did not pay 4s. a head.

MR. GLADSTONE: As far as my knowledge goes, on the whole, these assemblies take place with extremely small inconvenience to the public.

### Lawlessness in London.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what answer he proposes to make to the representations which have been addressed to him by the Borough Council of Shoreditch and others as to the lawlessness which is alleged to prevail in certain parts of London.

MR. GLADSTONE: The representation from the Shoreditch Borough Council to which the hon. Member refers only reached me to-day. It shall have my careful consideration. I may say that I have already had reason to think the condition of the district unsatisfactory, and it is receiving the attention of myself and of the Commissioner of Metropolitan Police.

### Inspection of Laundries.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can now say when the Bill dealing with the inspection of laundries will be introduced.

MR. GLADSTONE: The Bill was introduced in the House of Lords, under the title of the Factory and Workshop Bill, on the 2nd of this month, and read a second time yesterday afternoon.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Too late, I fear.

### Vivisection Licences.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department who are the expert advisers upon whose Report he relies before deciding whether applications for licences and new certificates should be granted or refused to vivisectors.

MR. GLADSTONE: The whole procedure is fully detailed in the appendix to the first Report of the Royal Commission, and I may especially refer my hon. friend to pages 8, 10, 15 and 17.

### Women Weavers and their Dinner Hour.

MR. BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Mr. J. H. Rogers, a factory inspector, stated before the Clitheroe magistrates on the 8th instant that if women weavers insisted on working during their dinner hour they should be beaten; whether this statement was sanctioned by the Home Office; and, if not, whether he will take steps to protect the weaving industry of Clitheroe from the further attentions of this official.

MR. GLADSTONE: The inspector referred to informs me that he made no such statement.

MR. BOWLES: The statement was reported in the prominent papers in the district and commented on in large type. What publicity will be given to the denial?

MR. GLADSTONE: I presume my Answer to-day will also be reported.

### Cahirciveen Pier.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received the copy of a resolution passed by the Cahirciveen Ratepayers' Protective Association on 24th April with reference to the proposed improvements to the pier at Cahirciveen; and whether he proposes to take any, and, if so, what action in the matter.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE): I have received a copy of the resolution in question. The improvement to which the association takes exception is proposed to be carried out by Trinity

College in pursuance of the recommendation made by the Board of Trade inspector after a local inquiry. At the time of the inquiry the improvement was accepted by those interested as a satisfactory equivalent for the accommodation which they lost by the erection of a store on the quay, and the Kerry County Council afterwards passed a resolution urging that it should be carried out. The Board of Trade have already intimated to Trinity College that they are prepared to give their sanction to the proposed improvement.

### Shipping Dues.

MR. J. WARD: On behalf of the hon. Member for South Glamorgan, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that thirty-two dock and harbour authorities, eleven in England and Wales, eleven in Scotland, and ten in Ireland, have had powers granted them by Parliament to levy dues on vessels upon a minimum percentage of the gross tonnage, in some cases of forty and in others of fifty per cent.; and whether, having regard to the Merchant Shipping (Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill now before the House, he proposes to take any measures to safeguard such powers.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE): There is nothing in the Bill now before the House which would prejudice the powers granted by Parliament to the dock and harbour authorities referred to by my hon. friend.

### Poor Relief Committee.

MR. BROOKE (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board how many of the different boards of guardians in London have power now, under Orders from his Board, to assign their duties of giving relief to a Relief Committee; how many are now exercising that power; and what are their names.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): All boards of guardians in London except those for the Poor Law Unions of St. George-in-the-East, Hampstead, Stepney, and Whitechapel are empowered to appoint Relief Committees under Orders issued by the Local Government Board or their predecessors. The power is generally exercised, but there is no Relief Committee in the Poor Law Unions of Mile End and the Strand, whilst at Paddington, Shoreditch, and Westminster, and in certain circumstances at Bethnal Green, the Committee consists of the whole Board.

### Education Code.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education when the Code for the present year will be presented, printed, and circulated among Members; and whether a full opportunity will be given to the House of discussing the Code and the Education Estimates this year.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouth, N.): It will not be long, I hope, before the Code is laid upon the Table, but I am unable at present to fix the precise date. One of the allotted days will be devoted to the discussion of the Education Estimates.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL: Including the Code?

MR. MCKENNA: Yes; that is one of the subjects that can be discussed on the Estimates.

### Secondary Schools.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he intends to make any proposals in the course of the session relating to secondary schools; and, if so, at what date such proposals will be submitted for the consideration of the House.

MR. MCKENNA: Such proposals as I have to make will be included in the Secondary School Regulations, which will, I hope, be presented to Parliament shortly after the Recess.

### Board of Education—Medical Department.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyne): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what immediate steps he proposes to take with a view to obtaining expert opinion as to the advisability of establishing a permanent medical department at the Board of Education, seeing that this matter was not considered by the Inter-Departmental Committee on Medical Inspection two years ago, and seeing that no information concerning any other expert advice is available for consideration by this House.

MR. MCKENNA: I can assure my hon. friend that experts have not failed to give me the great advantage of their advice upon this question. The opinions which I have received from them are by no means wanting in variety.

### Office of Works Staff.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will give particulars of the increase of staff, and the salaries paid to the persons employed, involving an increase of £7,318 in the Estimate for the Office of Works.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale): The hon. Member will find all the facts in relation to this matter on pp. 185–187 of the Civil Service Estimates, Class II., Vote 25.

### Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew—Wages of Employees.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can now state to the House the decision of the Treasury in regard to the wages of the employees at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The Treasury have sanctioned an increase from 23s. to 24s. a week in the wages of labourers who have given five years satisfactory service, and they have agreed to the wages of the gangers and the head-carter being raised from 25s. to 26s. a week. They have also expressed their willingness to grant some concession in respect of hours of work to the constables and museum porters, who are at present required to attend seven days a week, and receive only one day in twenty-eight in lieu of Sunday attendance. The details of this latter concession are under consideration.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: How many men will this affect?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I cannot say.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Why do you not know it?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Stokers at Kew Gardens.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he is aware that, since the Board granted a fifty-seven hour week to the stokers in the palm-house section of Kew Gardens, the men have had additional work given to them, such work having previously been done by men from another department; and, if so, will he state what action, if any, he proposes to take in the matter.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Prior to the recent reduction in the hours of labour certain labourers were employed in stoking, and were paid as stokers, during the period from November to February, when the work is heaviest, and during the remainder of the year reverted to the pay and *status* of labourers. Under the new arrangement a staff of six stokers is permanently employed and paid as such throughout the year, but during the winter period it is still necessary to call in the assistance of labourers to overtake the work. Between March and October, however, the stokers are able to undertake the whole of the work, and the assistance of labourers is therefore not required. There is no doubt that the present arrangement is a substantial benefit to the stokers, and the only alternative would be to revert to the old arrangement, whereby some of them were reduced to the *status* and pay of labourers during the greater part of the year.

### Scottish Justices of the Peace.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he is aware that justices of the peace in Scotland are in the habit of sitting on the Bench while their partners or joint agents with them plead the cases at the bar; if this system has his sanction; and, if not, if he will take steps to put a stop to it in future.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): I am not aware of any disregard of the statutory provisions bearing on disqualifications of justices, but if my hon. friend can furnish me with the specific facts on which his Question is based I shall willingly have them inquired into.

### Salmon Fisheries in Scotland.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can give the names of the lochs, rivers, and burns in which salmon fishing takes place in Scotland and which are still the property of the Woods and Forests Department, the number of such that are let for private fishing, and the number over which anglers in general have a right to fish.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The Answer to this Question is rather long, and with the hon. Member's permission I will circulate it with the Votes to-morrow.†

### New Irish Council.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the amount paid in salaries and administration of the eight Boards proposed to be handed over to the new Irish Council, and the amount proposed to be saved under the committee system of administration.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): I propose to lay upon the Table a Return which will contain among other things the information asked for in the Question.

### Irish Local Government Appointments—Religious Pressure.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will favourably consider the advisability of promoting a short Bill introducing the same clause, as to religious pressure being brought to bear in the selection of candidates for local government appointments in Ireland and the penalties to be imposed for so doing, as is proposed in the new Irish Council Bill into the existing Local Government Acts, and making it retrospective.

MR. BIRRELL: The Government do not contemplate taking any such action.

### Reenard Pier.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to say what decision has been come with reference to the construction of a pier at Reenard, county Kerry.

MR. BIRRELL: The Irish Government have provisionally approved of a scheme for improving the existing pier accommodation at Reenard Point at an estimated cost of £2,500. A plan of the proposed scheme has been prepared by the Board of Works, and the Government are now in communication with the county council and the Congested Districts Board as to the fufilment by these bodies of the requirements of the Marine Works Act. As soon as the necessary assurances on this point have been received the sanction of the Treasury will be applied for.

### Belfast Mail Car Contracts.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the terms of the contracts for carrying the mails by car from Belfast to Grey Abbey, Kircubbin, Ballyhalbert, Portavogie, Ballywalter, and Portaferry, and the dates on which these contracts expire.

MR. BIRRELL: This Question should have been addressed to the Postmaster-General. My right hon. friend asks me to say that it is not usual to state publicly the terms of these contracts.

### Mr. Timothy O'Rorke, J.P.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Timothy O'Rorke, J.P., has been appointed by the Congested Districts Board for taking and settling grazing cattle on derelict farms they have on hand.

MR. BIRRELL: Mr. O'Rorke and other local persons have been appointed for a few days, as was done last year, to assist the Congested Districts Board's stockmaster in taking cattle to graze on lands which are in the Board's hands pending their division into new holdings.

---

† See col. 934.

Mr. LONSDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mr. O'Rorke was on the platform at a United Irish League meeting, when advice was given by one of the speakers that certain persons should be boycotted?

Mr. BIRRELL: I think he is much better engaged in taking cattle to graze on the land.

### Elphin Demonstration.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether police reporters were present at a United Irish League meeting in the public street at Elphin on the 25th of March last; whether the advice then given by two district councillors to boycott the farmers who had taken land under the eleven months system, was duly reported; and why, seeing that, in consequence of the intimidation which followed these proceedings, several farmers were compelled to relinquish their holdings, no prosecution has been instituted against the leaders in this agitation.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed that the meeting in question was not attended by police reporters, but policemen were present in the ordinary course of their duty. The proceedings were duly reported. Three prosecutions are pending in county Roscommon against twelve, eight, and six persons respectively for offences arising out of the agitation against the grazing system, and one of the district councillors referred to in the Question is a defendant.

### Newmarket-on-Fergus Outrage.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a night attack was recently made upon the house of a man named Boland, caretaker of an evicted farm near Newmarket-on-Fergus, during which several shots were fired into the dwelling; and whether any arrests have taken place in connection with this occurence.

Mr. BIRRELL: On the night of 21st April, Boland heard a noise like a gunshot near his house, and on the following morning he found that some panes of glass in the window of an unoccupied room were broken. The offender was not seen. No arrest has been made.

### Rinneen Outrage.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received particulars of the shooting of a young man named John Murphy, who resides at Rinneen, in the Ruane district, county Clare; whether he is aware that he was fired at from behind a hedge and badly wounded; whether he is acquainted with the reasons which prompted this attack; and whether any person has been arrested in connection with this attack.

Mr. BIRRELL: I have received police reports on this matter. It is the fact that Murphy was fired at from behind a fence and seriously wounded. I have no information as to the reasons which may have prompted the attack, but I am aware that Murphy holds part of a grazing farm. No arrests have yet been made. The police are still investigating the case.

### Steam Trawling in Ballinskelligs Bay.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that steam trawlers have lately been fishing inside the legal limits off the coast of Ballinskelligs and Valentia, county Kerry, notably on the 5th instant; can he state what were the last two occasions on which the "Helga" visited this district; whether, in view of the difficulty of judging from the shore the exact position of the present legal limits, he will represent to the proper authority the necessity of compelling the trawlers to fish outside the Skelligs Rock; and whether, seeing that it is impossible for one boat, such as the "Helga" with its slow speed, to patrol the entire West Coast of Ireland effectively, he will represent to the Admiralty the advisability of detaching a cruiser or torpedo boats to assist the "Helga" in her work.

Mr. BIRRELL: Steam trawling is prohibited in Ballinskelligs Bay. The Department of Agriculture recently learnt that three vessels had been observed there, and at once despatched their steam cruiser to the locality. The vessel had last been in the district from 31st January to 9th February and from the 17th to the 27th March. The Department's arrangements provide for keeping the locality under constant observation. The Admiralty do not enforce by-laws which prohibit steam trawling, but they protect Irish territorial waters from foreign vessels. The enforcement of the by-laws relating to steam trawling rests with the Department, and they hold that the steps hitherto taken with that object have been reasonably sufficient, as is shown by the great decrease in illegal trawling which has taken place.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): If there is power of prosecution will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of offering rewards to local fishermen for information calculated to secure the conviction of the offenders?

MR. BIRRELL: I will consider that.

### Kilmore Demonstration.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Sunday, the 5th instant, a crowd of between 2,000 and 3,000 persons assembled at Kilmore, county Roscommon, near the house of Mr. Samuel Russell, a landlord and owner of several large grazing farms, for the purpose of demonstrating against him and bringing pressure to bear on him to force him to sell his grazing lands; that Mr. Russell was assaulted and stoned when returning from church; and that a force of 300 police had to be requisitioned to keep the peace; and what steps the Government are taking to prevent a repetition of any such demonstrations.

MR. BIRRELL: In this case proceedings have been instituted against eight persons in connection with the occurrence of the 5th instant, and while those proceedings are pending I must decline to enter into the details of the case. I think it only right, however, to say that according to the police reports which I have received, 200 and not 2,000 persons were present at the meeting referred to; the police force numbered 30, not 300; and Mr. Russell was not assaulted or stoned.

### Athenry Outrage.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any of the party of men who in October last, close to the town of Athenry, fired at and severely wounded a policeman named O'Halloran who was engaged in protecting the house of Colonel Lopdell, have yet been made amenable to justice.

MR. BIRRELL: Three men were arrested shortly after the occurrence, but were discharged for want of evidence. No further arrest has been made.

### Loughrea Grazing Farm Outrages.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether on 29th April last a crowd of about 300 men assembled in the neighbourhood of Loughrea and marched to the grazing farms at Earl's Park, Ballinlawless, and Tullyhill, where they cleared the farms of all the cattle by driving them on to the public road; whether a force of twelve police, in attempting to prevent the cattle being driven off, were assaulted, and the head constable and two sergeants wounded; whether this is part of an organised campaign to clear out all the tenants of grazing farms; and what steps the Government is taking to cope with this movement.

MR. BIRRELL: A prosecution against ten men has been instituted in connection with the occurrence of 29th April. The case is *sub judice*.

### Clooniskert Grazing Farm Outrage.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on 1st May a number of persons assembled on the farm of Batty O'Brien at Clooniskert, county Roscommon, and drove his cattle on to the public road, to force O'Brien to give up his grazing farm for distribution amongst the neighbouring farmers; whether the police were present during the proceedings; whether they have summoned any of those who took part therein; and, if so, with what result.

MR. BIRRELL: On May 1st a number of persons assembled on a grazing farm occupied by Mr. O'Brien and drove the cattle from it to that gentleman's residence. I am informed that Mr. O'Brien had arranged to give the farm up for distribution among local tenants, and had appointed the 1st of May as the day on which he would surrender the farm. He failed, however, to appear on that day, and the people therefore took his cattle to his residence. It appears that the landlord had refused to release Mr. O'Brien from his tenancy. The police were present when the cattle were driven off, but in the circumstances mentioned it has not been considered necessary to institute criminal proceedings.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Was the agreement to give up this farm the direct result of intimidation or boycotting by the local branch of the United Irish League?

MR. BIRRELL: I am afraid I cannot answer as to the motives which led to the giving up of the farm. No doubt a certain amount of intimidation and pressure was used.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman confer with the Secretary of State for India as to the best means of putting down intimidation in Ireland?

### Town Tenants' League, Athenry.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Town Tenants' League, of Athenry, served notices in April last on the grazing tenants of Caheroyan to give up their farms; that on 1st May crowds assembled with the intention of driving the cattle off the farms, but were prevented from doing so by the police; and that, owing to the intimidation and boycott to which these tenants have since been subjected, they have been compelled to give up their farms; and what steps His Majesty's Government is taking in the matter to ensure that peaceable subjects shall be able to exercise the ordinary rights and privileges of citizenship.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that the tenants referred to received notices to the effect mentioned, which purported to have been sent by the Town Tenants' League. The majority of the tenants removed their cattle from the farms before the 1st May. On that day crowds assembled with the object, as was understood, or driving the cattle off the remaining farms; but they were prevented from doing so by a large force of police which was assembled for the purpose. Subsequently the remaining tenants removed their cattle from the farms. In these cases the full protection of the law was given, and the Government will continue to afford such protection to all persons who need it. The police force in the Athenry district has been doubled, and the whole question of the police arrangements in the Riding is under consideration.

### Ballinmore Bridge Outrage.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on 1st May the cattle were driven off Muckland Farm, near Ballinmore Bridge, by a crowd of men; that on the night of 30th April the cattle and sheep of Patrick Raftery were driven off the grazing farm of Cuskeydally, and scattered amongst the bogs and by roads of the neighbourhood; and that the walls on the farms were thrown down during the same night; and will he say what action he is taking in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The facts are generally as stated in the Question. In the first case, the cattle were driven to the owner's residence and given up to him. The cattle were subsequently put back without opposition, an amicable agreement having been come to between the owner and the local tenants. In the second case, the cattle were driven off the farm at night through gaps in a loose stone wall. The cattle were recovered uninjured. In the first case it was not considered necessary to take proceedings, as the people had abandoned their attitude of opposition. In the second case the offenders were unknown.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: What was the amicable arrangement come to?

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot say.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: Will the right hon. Gentleman make inquiry?

Mr. BIRRELL: If you like, yes.

### Irish Motor Communication Scheme.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has recently had any communication from Lord Pirrie with reference to his scheme for improving the means of communication in Ireland by motors.

Mr. BIRRELL: No, Sir.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: Has the right hon. Gentleman any reason to believe that the promotion of the noble Lord to another place has somewhat cooled his ardour?

Mr. BIRRELL: No, I think not, strange to say.

### Grazing Farm Disputes.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether in view of the number of landlords and tenants of grazing farms who have, by intimidation, boycotting, and other illegal means, been forced to give up possession of their farms so that they might be divided up amongst other tenants, he will consider the necessity of bringing into force again the rule which forbade the Estates Commissioners either buying or advancing the purchase money of any farm on any estate where intimidation or boycotting exists.

Mr. BIRRELL: I beg to refer to the Answer which I gave to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for the Oswestry Division.

Mr. MOORE: The right hon. Gentleman stated there was not sufficient intimidation to constitute a real danger. Will he reconsider that?

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Is not the right hon. Gentleman perfectly well aware that as the 1st May, the date on which these eleven months agreements were entered into, approaches, there is an immense amount of extra intimidation and boycotting in the counties of Galway, Roscommon and Leitrim?

Mr. BIRRELL: I am aware that the time referred to is one of great anxiety to the police and special precautions have to be taken.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that by the very simple method of procedure for enforcing the law, introduced by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin County, S., this boycotting and intimidation could be stopped in one day?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is a matter of argument.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: But that is really the Question over again.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not say it was not. I said it was an argumentative question which is not in order.

Mr. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.): Have the prosecutions which have taken place been the result of Questions in this House?

Mr. BIRRELL: No, Sir.

### Irish Board of Agriculture Finance.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the amount of the funds at the disposal of the Board of Agriculture for the coming year; and whether he will dispose of them in equal shares between each county in Ireland, or will he state how he intends to deal with their fair distribution.

Mr. BIRRELL: The receipts from the Department's Endowment Fund in the current financial year are estimated to amount to £189,700. The money is applied for the purposes and in the proportions prescribed by Section 16 of the Act creating the Department. The funds available for county schemes for the improvement of agriculture are not allocated to the counties in equal shares, but are applied in accordance with the principle laid down in the Sub-section 6 of the Section quoted, regard being had to the nature and extent of the approved schemes in operation in each county.

### Police Protection in County Galway.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he is aware that on the 7th May last a force of constabulary was required to protect farmers named Hughes, of Mucklon, near Ballyforan, county Galway, when putting back stock driven off their holding some days previous; can he state how many constabulary were present belonging to the local force and the depot, respectively; can he state the expense incurred; and whether anyone was brought to justice.

Mr. BIRRELL: The fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. The number of police employed on protection duty was fifty, all of whom belonged to the county force. The expense incurred was approximately £25. No opposition was offered by the people on the occasion, and there was therefore no necessity for bringing anyone to justice.

### Ballymoney Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

Mr. GLENDINNING (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he has had a resolution directed to him by the Ballymoney Rural District Council concerning a labourer's cottage in Carnfinton, in the Ballymoney rural district; and, seeing that the tenant is not owner and occupier and that the Local Government Board and the landlord have blocked the building of the cottage, when the tenant and the rural council are anxious to build, whether he will grant an inquiry into the facts.

Mr. MOORE: Have this council shown their enthusiasm for the Labourers Acts by adjourning for twelve months the offer to give immediate possession of an estate selected for labourers' cottages?

Mr. BIRRELL: I beg to refer the hon. Member to the answer which I gave to his previous Question of 24th April.† By the provisional order issued by the Local Government Board in this case the rural district council were authorised to acquire the plot by agreement, it having been stated in evidence given on behalf of the council that the tenant of the plot was also the owner of it. It has since been ascertained that this evidence was incorrect, and it is entirely due to that fact that the council's present difficulty has arisen. The Local Government Board are placing no obstacle in the way of the council, but are merely awaiting the arrangement by the council of terms of purchase. There is no dispute as to the facts of the case and an inquiry is therefore unnecessary.

Captain CRAIG: Is it not the fact that the rural council in question selects sites which are calculated to give rise to opposition?

### Morley Estate, County Cavan.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the Estates Commissioners have received the Report from their inspectors on the Morley estate, county Cavan; have the Estates Commissioners made an offer to the owners to purchase; if so, when; and will he say how matters now stand with regard to this estate.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have recently received their inspectors' report in this case, and will consider it as soon as possible with a view to making an offer for the purchase of the estate.

### The Irish Treasury.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the new Government Department, to be called the Irish Treasury, proposed to be created under the Irish Council Bill, will be subject to the control of the Irish Council.

Mr. BIRRELL: Yes, Sir.

### Irish Equivalent Grants.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether, in the event of Parliament voting within the next seven years increased amounts to English Departments or authorities analagous to those that will come under the authority of the proposed Irish Council, he will make provision that an equivalent amount shall be paid into the Irish Fund and Irish Treasury; and, if not, why not.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Bill proceeds upon the basis that the financial provision is adequate to meet the requirements of the eight Departments during the quinquennial period. In the event of additional provision being made for English and Scottish services, the question of voting moneys to Ireland by way of equivalent grant will be one for the decision of Parliament as occasion may arise.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 59–60.

### Irish Departments—Constitution.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland how many elected and how many nominated members constitute each of the following Departments, namely, the Council of Agriculture, the Agricultural Board, and the Board of Technical Instruction.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Council of Agriculture consists of sixty-eight elected and thirty-four nominated members; the Agricultural Board of eight elected and four nominated members; and the Board of Technical Instruction of fifteen elected and six nominated members. The President and Vice-President of the Department are *ex-officio* members of these bodies.

### Irish Departments — Lord-Lieutenant's and Chief Secretary's Powers of Appointment or Dismissal.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what officers it is competent for the Lord-Lieutenant or Chief Secretary to appoint or dismiss in the following Departments, namely, the Local Government Board for Ireland, the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland, the Congested Districts Board for Ireland, the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, the Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools, the Registrar-General, the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, and the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland.

Mr. BIRRELL: If the hon. Member should see fit to move for a Return, I will offer no objection to its being granted.

### Police Protection on Grazing Farms.

Mr. ARKWRIGHT (Hereford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state how many police are at present employed in affording protection to the occupiers of grazing farms in the counties of Galway, Mayo, Roscommon, Leitrim, and Westmeath.

Mr. BIRRELL: Eighty-one policemen are occupied in affording protection to the occupiers of grazing farms in the counties of Galway, Mayo, and Roscommon. In addition, some 400 police secure the stock on the farms from molestation.

Viscount TURNOUR: Does the right hon. Gentleman consider that the force of police is sufficient to prevent any of these outrages taking place in the future?

Mr. BIRRELL: Any request made by the police for further men is always very carefully considered. I am told that the force is sufficient at present.

### Local Taxation (Ireland) Account.

Mr. PATRICK WHITE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the total amount of payments made to the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account out of the Consolidated Fund or out of any revenue for the years 1901–2, 1903, 1904, and 1905 respectively; and for what Departments and under what Acts they were made.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The total payments, partly from the Consolidated Fund and partly from assigned Revenues, in the respective years were: 1901–2, £1,445,403; 1902-3, £1,441,079; 1903-4, £1,435,374; 1904–5, £1,432,918. Some of the grants included in these totals are not paid direct into the Local Taxation (Ireland) Account. They are paid in the first instance to the Guarantee Fund under the Land Purchase Acts and are subsequently transferred to the Local Taxation Account after the claims on that Fund have been met. The Acts of Parliament governing the payments are the Customs and Inland Revenue Act, 1890; the Land Purchase (Ireland) Act, 1891; the Finance Act, 1894; and the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898. The application of moneys out of the Local Taxation Account is not under the control of the Treasury, but of the Irish Government.

### Irish Lotteries.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that invitations to participate in Irish lotteries are being largely circulated in this country; whether there is any law in force forbidding the holding of such lotteries; and, if not, whether he will introduce legislation extending the Lottery Act to Ireland.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool Exchange): I have no official intimation that invitations to participate in Irish lotteries are being largely circulated in England, but I believe the fact to be as stated by the hon. Member. The law on the subject is the same in England and in Ireland. In both countries such lotteries are illegal; so that there is no necessity for any such legislation as the hon. Member suggests.

### The Prime Minister and the Condition of Ireland.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the increasing number of outrages throughout the south and west of Ireland; whether he has any official information showing that they have been instigated or condoned by the United Irish League, and, if so, whether the Government intend to proceed further with the Irish Council Bill; and, if they do, will he give a day before the Second Reading to debate the state of affairs at present existing.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I am not aware that there is any foundation for the suggestion contained in the first part of the Question. My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary informs me that the condition of Ireland as a whole is very satisfactory, though in certain limited areas disturbances have recently taken place in consequence of the agitation against the grazing system. Proper measures are being taken for the preservation of the peace in these districts, and there does not seem to be any reason why the present state of Ireland should be debated.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Will the right hon. Gentleman in his leisure time look to the Questions addressed to the Chief Secretary and the Answers thereto as showing the state of the country?

MR. MOONEY (Newry): Is it not within the knowledge of the House that the invariable Answer to the Questions put by hon. Members is a direct denial on the part of the Government?

VISCOUNT TURNOUR asked if the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to say that the state of the west of Ireland was satisfactory.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have given all the information I have, and it is quite sufficient for my purpose. With regard to the Questions and Answers referred to, the conclusion I have come to on the whole matter is that there never was an Answer given in the House to some hon. Gentleman that would not have a Question arising out of it.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: May I press for an Answer to my Question as to whether these outrages have been instigated or condoned by the United Irish League?

MR. T. L. CORBETT: Was the right hon. Gentleman present when the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary made very grave admissions this afternoon as to the state of Ireland?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the Question.

### Unemployed Fund.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister what is the total amount disbursed under the Unemployed Fund since its creation, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The sum voted in 1906–7 in aid of expenses under the Unemployed Workmen Act was £200,000. The actual expenditure out of the Vote in the three countries has been: England, £105,420; Scotland, £7,552; Ireland, £11,050; total, £124,022.

### Unrest in India.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the Prime

Minister if a day can be allotted immediately after the Whitsuntide holidays to discuss the causes of unrest and discontent in India, in connection especially with the excessive taxation of land and its impoverishment of the people.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My right hon. friend the Secretary of State for India expressed doubts on Monday as to the desirability, in the public interest, of discussion at the present moment. I share those doubts, and inasmuch as the debate on the Indian financial statement (which I hope will be taken at a very early date after the recess) will afford hon. Members ample opportunity to place their views before the House, I am not prepared to allot a day specially for the purpose.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: Will ample time be given for the discussion of this very important question?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think a full day for the Indian Budget will give ample time.

### Blocking Motions.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the situation in India, he will ask the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs to remove his Motion, which prevents the House from discharging its duty to India, and in fact reduces the House at a critical period to a condition of paralysis and impotence.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs), on a point of order, asked whether the hon. Member was in order in imputing to him that he could possibly be influenced by any right hon. or hon. Gentleman in regard to taking off or putting on any Motion; and further, whether the hon. Gentleman should not have addressed his Question to him, in which case he would have had an Answer suited to his intervention.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir. I do not think that I can interfere in these personal amenities. My hon. friend ought to address himself to the hon. Member for the Montgomery Boroughs. But I would refer my hon. friend to the Answer I have just given to my hon. friend the Member for Walworth.

DR. RUTHERFORD asked if the Government would not take action with reference to these blocking Motions generally?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes, Sir, we are willing to do so. As I have repeatedly stated in answer to demands from the other side—strange coming from the other side—[Cries from the OPPOSITION Benches, "Why?"]—hon. Members who are so anxious were not present in the previous Parliament, otherwise they would understand why—there is nothing more to be said on that subject just now. We are considering the best form of rule, but it will not be proceeded with unless it obtains the full assent of both sides of the House.

MR. MOORE: Will it be brought forward along with the Resolutions relating to the House of Lords?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not see that they have much to do with each other. Perhaps, however, the word "blocking" suggests a connection to the hon. Member.

### Sittings of the House.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can now state whether the Government intend to proceed with the session continuously to end in August or September, or whether they intend to adjourn in the summer months and resume the session in the autumn.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The time has not come when a positive Answer can be given to this Question. We are anxious, if possible, to avoid an autumn session.

---

## SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Dr. Macnamara; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Report to lie upon the Table.

## EDUCATION (POPULAR CONTROL).

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil) asked leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to the management of public elementary schools not provided by the local education authority. He said its object was to amend the Education Act of 1902 by providing that the local authority should have two-thirds representation on the managament of non-provided schools instead of one-third as at present, or, in other words, that out of the six managers four should be appointed by the local education authority instead of two. An Amendment of that kind, he said, was proposed when the Act of 1902 was under discussion in that House, and was supported by the whole of the then Opposition who were now on the Government side of the House. Since then the country had undoubtedly given the Government a mandate in favour of popular control. Unfortunately the Government so far had not been able to give effect to that mandate, and there seemed to be no prospect of their doing so in this Parliament. The Bill was urgent in the case of Wales, where a revolt policy had been adopted. He was not going to justify that policy, but the fact remained, whether it was right or not, that it had been adopted by nearly all the education authorities in Wales, and it was likely to remain so unless some amendment was made. He hoped and believed that this Bill would remove the friction and bitterness which existed in Wales, and also remove any excuse for the policy adopted by the local authorities. The Welsh local authorities declined to contribute anything out of the rates towards the maintenance of non-provided schools because they had no measure of control over them. A discrimination was made by the local education authorities between the two classes of schools—public and denominational—and over that discrimination the Board of Education had no authority or control whatever. The result was that in Glamorganshire, which was far the largest county in Wales, something like 38 or 40 per cent. more money was spent out of county funds on public than on denominational schools. Although the education in the non-provided schools came up to the statutory efficiency required by the Board of Education, the standard could not be the same as in the provided schools. That inflicted hardships upon the teachers, who did not receive the same salaries, and the children not only of Churchmen and Catholics, but also of Nonconformists, who attended those schools must in consequence suffer. The system had engendered an amount of bitterness in Wales of which the majority of Members of that House had no conception. He hoped the House would agree to the introduction of the Bill, and that the Prime Minister would carefully consider whether he could give facilities for its progress.

Motion made, and Question, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the law relating to the management of public elementary schools not provided by the local education authority"—(*Mr. D. A. Thomas*)—put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. David Alfred Thomas, Mr. Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Brace, Mr. David Davies, Mr. Samuel Evans, Colonel Herbert, Sir David Brynmor Jones, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Wynford Philipps, Mr. Robinson, and Mr. Osmond Williams.

## EDUCATION (POPULAR CONTROL) BILL.

"To amend the law relating to the management of public elementary schools not provided by the local education authority," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 28th May, and to be printed. [Bill 204.]

---

## THE WHITSUNTIDE RECESS.

Motion made—"That the House at its rising on May 16th, do adjourn until Thursday, May 23rd."—*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*

*SIR JOHN KENNAWAY said he wished to ask the Foreign Secretary to give the House some information regarding the progress of the Congo question. The hearts of the people had been deeply stirred, as was shown by a movement not confined to the Churches. In all the crowded centres of population large meetings had been held, presided over by the chief magistrates to protest against the continuance of the system of misrule on the Congo, where, by the imposition of forced labour for private profit, almost the whole of the population had been reduced to a condition of slavery and bondage under most barbarous conditions. It was not merely on humanitarian grounds that a settlement of the question was sought. The recent letter of Sir Henry Johnstone, who was well qualified to speak on the subject, showed that its continuance was raising a feeling among the negro races which constituted a growing menace to white administration in Africa. He felt a great responsibility in bringing the question forward, and recognised that it ought to be handled with extreme delicacy, lest they should seem to give a friendly nation any ground for thinking that it was their desire to interfere with their affairs and with their freedom of action. Belgium and England were united by closest ties of alliance, friendship, and community of interests. They knew how intimate was the connection of the two Royal Houses. He had, himself, warm recollections of hospitality and kindness, received at the Brussels Conference of 1876, at the hands of the King. But the fact was clear that the Congo Free State which came into existence as a great philanthropic enterprise had become the scene of vast profits earned by slave labour, and had thereby produced a scandal of great dimensions. Where did England's duty come in the matter? She was largely responsible for the Berlin Treaty of 1892. The Congo Free State would never have come into existence but for the co-operation and sanction and help of Great Britain. Remonstrances had been made again and again. They had hoped against hope. They had looked for reforms which it was said were going to be arrived at. They had been told that the sufferings of the natives and the cruelties perpetrated were exaggerated. He thought he had the authority of the right hon. Gentleman for saying that the statements had been corroborated to the full, and that the reforms were nothing but a delusion and a snare. Their attention had been called to the Parliamentary crisis in Belgium, but he was afraid that the result of that Parliamentary crisis had been to put an even stronger contingent of the King's Party in the new Government than there was in the previous Government, and a contingent less favourable to freedom. There had been going on, and was going on now, an attempt to start the annexation to Belgium of the Congo, which would leave the King in complete control, and Belgium was being deluded into thinking that a valuable property was being put before her, and that England, against whom a torrent of abuse had been, and was being poured out, was wishing to keep her out of it. That new scheme of annexation would practically uphold the present system in all essentials. They were raising the question that day with the earnest desire to support His Majesty's Government in pressing for reform. He hoped it would be made clear to the people of Belgium that if she annexed the Congo she was bound by the terms of the Act of Berlin, interpreted so as to mean that the native of the Congo had an unquestioned right to sell his labour freely. They wished to consider in every way the susceptibilities of the Belgian people, but they felt it to be their clear duty to try to inform them on this matter, and to show that the proposed form of annexation would give them no real control at all. They asked the Belgian people to demand from their Government and from the King the whole truth about the state of affairs in the Congo, its provinces, its liabilities, its revenue and expenditure, in order that they might be able to judge for themselves as to whether the continuance of the system would conduce to their honour and the continuance of their high fame. In the last resource, they hoped that England, backed by the other Powers, would insist that a free State, established under international powers, and subject to international treaties, should become the subject of international consideration. The Foreign Secretary would know how that might be brought about—whether a conference could be summoned or other action might be possible. They believed in his earnest desire to press forward this matter. They recognised the difficulties that surrounded his action, and they desired to give him all the support and encouragement in their power.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that in bringing forward this question they all, he thought, spoke with a very deep sense of responsibility, and followed the lines and tone adopted by the right hon. Baronet opposite. It would be very easy to do harm in this delicate question were they not to speak on the subject with responsibility. It was unnecessary to go into the past history of the question; they had to deal with the present situation to which the right hon. Baronet had directed his remarks. No one could speak more weightily than the right hon. Gentleman on the subject, because he had taken a prominent part in connection with the Congo State. In 1877 he was one of those who believed in the enterprise of King Leopold, and as President of the Church Missionary Society, a member of the Comite d'Études du Haut Congo, and of the international anti-slavery societies, he helped to put King Leopold into the place of Portugal to protect the natives. The enterprise had turned out sadly, as they all admitted. The Congo State, as the right hon Baronet had told them, was international in its character. It had been brought into existence, as he thought the Powers generally contended, including even the United States, by the Berlin Act. To that statement, which was the foundation of their case, King Leopold replied that it was the United States which brought the Congo State into existence. If so, their case was virtually the same, because the American treaty, though made before the Berlin and other treaties, was on the same lines, and recognised the flag of the Congo Committee, of which the right hon. Baronet was a member. It was recognised that the State was founded for philanthropic objects, but in recent days the King of the Belgians had set up a claim couched in almost stronger terms than those of Louis XIV. which had been often quoted. The Congo State of the American treaty had no boundaries; it was a State in embryo. The United States, which King Leopold quoted as having created the Congo State, had expressed the same doctrine as our Government expressed, and it might be claimed, therefore, that the Government of the United States shared in the views which the right hon. Baronet had put forward. Such a conference as that suggested by the right hon. Baronet could be forced by us at any time. There were several obvious means, which it might or might not be wise to go into, by which we could bring about a conference. No one could read the Berlin Act without seeing that it was so. In reply to the deputation of last year and afterwards in the House of Commons, the Secretary of State used these words—

*Sir Charles Dilke.*

> "It was impossible for the Powers to contemplate the maintenance of the present *régime* in breach of the declaration of the Powers in the Berlin Act."

The right hon. Gentleman also said, which they were prepared to confirm—

> "That there was no one in this country who had any individual interest in this matter."

Our interest was national and philanthropic, because we were responsible in a high degree for the creation of the Congo State. That responsibility was a double one—a treble one, he might almost say. We were not only responsible as one of the Powers, but we were also responsible singly, and again doubly with America. Our responsibility as one of the Powers was an active one and admitted by all. The Government were responsible in a high degree, as the right hon. Baronet had said, as having been the Power which did the most to bring the Congo State into existence. We had the treaties made by Cameron and refused by Mr. Disraeli. We refused to take over the territory. We were encouraged by philanthropists and anti-slavery societies to give over the territory to King Leopold, and had it not been for us, Portugal, which had the old rights and a strong claim, would have been in possession. It was our action largely, and the action of the House of Commons and of the missionary bodies and anti-slavery societies, which turned out Portugal and put in King Leopold. We had also a joint responsibility with the United States, because had it not been for the action of the United States, the Berlin Conference would not have come about. His right hon. friend had alluded to the view of the Secretary of State as being that of both Front Benches and of Lord Lansdowne. His right hon. friend's words, in closing the discussion with the deputation last year were satisfactory, and he repeated them in the House afterwards. The Secretary of State said—

> "We wished for the Belgian solution, in order to obtain publicity and constitutional

responsibility in Belgium, which would give Europe some security. He desired Belgium to be unembarrassed in her choice which he wished her to exercise by taking over the Congo State."

The desire that Belgium should be "unembarrassed" meant, of course, unembarrassed except by the provisions of the Act of Berlin, of which she could not rid herself, except with the consent of Europe. Belgium could not free herself from her treaties except with the consent of the Powers and of the United States. In every other sense she was unembarrassed. They who had been all along connected with this question had held their hands; they had been careful, moderate, and reserved in their action in that House. It had been impossible to prevent public meetings, when the people were strongly excited by the accounts of what had taken place, but their action had been moderate and on correct lines. Belgium had been given much time and left, unembarrassed, to her choice. His right hon. friend the Secretary of State added that—

> "he refused to face the prospect of the continuance of the present *régime* for an indefinite time and thought it impossible to continue to recognise indefinitely the present state of things."

That was the crux of the question. Their case was that delay might create difficulties. Some months ago they were alarmed by seeing the statement that the action of the late Belgian Government was likely to be postponed until November. They were threatened by the late Belgian Government with postponement of the Bill to November, which might mean the beginning of next year. They were threatened by the new Belgian Government with a similar postponement. The scrupulous moderation of the Secretary of State's speeches had not met with due reward, and England, as represented by the uniform statements of Lord Lansdowne and the Foreign Secretary, was held up to execration as desiring to interfere with the liberty of Belgium. There was no trace of such a desire. Belgium could only by treaty take the Congo State as it existed; that was subject to the Berlin Act and to the treaties. Unless that was made clear to the Belgian Government, there was a risk that when Europe had to interfere, as, if the declaration of the new Cabinet was to stand, it must interfere, it would be face to face with an opinion of a majority in the present Belgian Chamber wilfully misled upon this point. The obvious danger of an interference which must then take place would be increased. The subject was one upon which France and Germany, as adjoining Powers to the Congo State, ought to come to an understanding. If the Belgian solution broke down, we recognised the French right of pre-emption, but it was possible that France might not desire to act fully on that right, and might, if Belgium chose to stand out, prefer to make fresh arrangements in which Germany would be a sharer, and in which, with our assent, there might be some measure of partition in which we should not desire to participate. The Lado enclave was, of course, only leased by us and fell back into the Soudan. Some time ago Lord Fitzmaurice pointed out, and his phrase was afterwards quoted by the noble Lord the Member for South Kensington, when Under-Secretary of State, that we would and in certain circumstances must take a forcible step which would immediately bring about a conference of the Powers. The same result might be attained by our proposing that we and the United States and Italy, and probably France, should resume consular jurisdiction over our own subjects in the Congo. Their case to-day was that the declaration of the new Belgian Government flew in the face of the Berlin Act and that their proposals did not seem calculated to produce publicity in the Congo administration; that, under these circumstances, delay in again making our position perfectly clear was dangerous. Our policy was that the Belgian Parliament should at once pass a Bill taking over the Congo State under conditions which would give the Belgian Parliament real power to improve the administration, and, failing that, recognition of the French right of pre-emption, and suggestion that France should be induced to communicate with Germany as to the eventual exercise of that right of pre-emption. Such a policy could alone avoid increased danger.

**Earl PERCY** (Kensington, S.): We are all agreed in believing that the best and probably the only solution of the evils of which we complain is what the right hon. Baronet has called the Belgian solution, the annexation of the Congo State by Belgium. All we have to consider on the present occasion is whether there are any steps we can take in order to bring about that desirable consummation. There is one step which I think we can take, if it has not been taken already, and that is to make it quite clear—I think the right hon. Gentleman has made it clear in his speeches to deputations, if not in his speeches in this House—that supposing the policy of annexation is rejected, there is nothing in the decrees promulgated last year which would reconcile His Majesty's Government to an indefinite prolongation of the existing state of things. To begin with there is considerable ambiguity on certain very important points as to the intentions of the authors of those decrees. I mentioned one last year. The Committee which sat to elaborate the reforms recommended that no fresh concessions should be granted to private companies which would involve powers of administration and taxation, and that though the existing companies might continue to exercise their present functions, they should be deprived of all power of coercion. But the Decrees went further than that, because they assigned the duty of levying taxation in future exclusively to special agents appointed by the State and acting under the authority of the District Commissioners. That seemed to imply that in future no persons could be employed in levying taxation who were in any way directly or indirectly connected with the affairs of the trading companies, and who, therefore, had a personal motive for extortion. If that was the interpretation it was the recognition of a very valuable principle. But no one, I think, can read the White-paper, published within the past few days, without very grave suspicion, amounting almost to a feeling of certainty, that the term "State agent" really means the agent of the companies, and, in point of fact, it is the same individual under a different name; and, in view of the rumours of fresh concessions on a large scale to American and other companies, this is a question to which I think it would be well worth while to draw the attention of the Congo Government, in order, if possible, to obtain an explanation. Then there is the question of how far the reforms which are embodied in these decrees have been carried into execution. If we are to judge from the reports of the vice-consuls in various parts of the Congo, and the reports of missionaries, I think we shall certainly arrive at the conclusion that the reforms which have been carried out are few and that they have produced very small results. Quite apart from those reports, I think we should arrive at the same conclusion from the circumstance referred to in the Belgian Parliament, namely, that last year there has been no such diminution in the rubber export as we should have expected if the decree had been carried out reducing the labour tax from sixty to forty hours a month. But the really important point with regard to these decrees, what makes it impossible to regard them as in any sense affording a basis for a permanent settlement of this problem, is the assumption upon which they rest, that reform in the Congo State is not to be regarded as an act of tardy justice and reparation which is to be carried out, whatever the cost, but as a distant ideal, a distant counsel of perfection which is not to interfere with the efficiency of the Congo State Government as an instrument for raising revenue. His Majesty's Government should make it clear that they cannot under any circumstances admit that financial difficulties supply any excuse for refusing to carry out the purposes, the prospect and promise of which alone secured recognition for the Congo State twenty-five years ago. It has been argued that even annexation by Belgium would not necessarily provide a remedy, and it has been suggested in some quarters that the right hon. Gentleman should make an announcement before the question comes up for decision in the Belgian Parliament that annexation will not have our approval unless it is accompanied by guarantees for what we are accustomed to regard as constitutional control. I am am not sure that annexation would be valueless even if it took place under the derisory conditions contemplated by the Colonial law. Almost anything will be better than the existing state of things. I cannot help thinking that, once the principle of national responsibility is accepted by Belgium, it will not be very long before the restrictions which hamper the action of Parliament will be swept away, and I think any announcement of the kind suggested would be both inexpedient and unnecessary. I cannot believe the Belgian people are likely to accept annexation except in circumstances which would enable them to put an end to abuses of which they are as conscious as we are ourselves. What we have to apprehend much more is that they may be deterred from undertaking annexation by the financial liabilities. That is the crucial point. If reforms are carried out and abuses are put a stop to it will mean a large loss of revenue, which will have to be made good out of the pockets of the Belgian taxpayers. That brings me to the only suggestion which I should like to put forward, and I do so in all humility on my own responsibility because I think it is worthy of some consideration. None of us are in a position to say how far, supposing effectual reforms are carried out, it will be possible to carry on the administration without a great discrepancy between revenue and expenditure. In the case of almost everyone of our British Protectorates, for a great number of years they could only be carried on by the assistance of large grants in aid. Belgium is precluded from raising any large amount of revenue in the form of indirect taxation by the provisions of the Berlin Act, which limit the rate of Customs duties to a very low scale and were inserted with the express idea of encouraging and freeing international trade. As a matter of fact, freedom of trade has been strangled by the introduction of the concessionary system. Assuming it would be possible by a moderate all-round increase of the Customs duties, which would not involve any differentiation between the imports of one Power and those of another, to make up for the deficit which would be caused in the revenue by the introduction of reforms, is it not worth while considering whether the Powers should not intimate their willingness to take into consideration the question of a revision of duties on condition that annexation by Belgium is accompanied by solid guarantees for the termination of abuses and the removal of restrictions which in fact have proved more injurious to the growth of trade than any tariff would have been? As to a further attempt being made to induce the various Powers to come together in a conference, the right hon. Gentleman will be able to inform the House whether the prospects of such a conference are more favourable now than when the late Government made the proposal. We have the very gratifying resolution passed on the motion of Senator Lodge in the United States Senate, and a very remarkable change of tone is noticeable both in the French and German Press. What is desired in this matter is not merely to carry other Powers with us, but, as far as possible, to carry with us public opinion in Belgium itself; and I cannot imagine a better way of doing that than by giving some concrete and tangible evidence that a conference, if it meets, will act in no hostile spirit towards Belgium, but only in the desire to give her every assistance in putting her own house in order.

*Mr. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock) said he thought that every Member of the House agreed that the time for the production of evidence against the administration of the Congo State was past and over. The evidence lay before them complete and indubitable, and all that remained for them was action based upon that evidence. Large and enthusiastic meetings had been held in practically every big town and city in the Kingdom, and he was certain that a very large number of thoughtful people in the country felt very deeply on the matter, and would be grievously disappointed if the present policy of drift were allowed to continue. Apart, however, from the mass of testimony accumulated in the past it was worth while noticing that the evils of Congo mis-government continued at this moment unabated. Missionaries and travellers continued to send in reports of the systematic barbarism practised by the Conglese officials, and one story recently reported by Mr. Bond, of the Balolo Mission—the gradual decimation of a village community by sordid and murderous cruelty—was one of the most terrible items in the long and appalling list of Congo atrocities. And if such things were actually going on under the very eyes of Englishmen, let hon. Members try to realise, if they could, the devilries which were being perpetrated in outlying districts of that vast area as yet unvisited by missionaries or travellers. If anyone were disposed partially to discount such evidence as that given above on the ground of its being too "sensational," let such a critic turn to a recent Report furnished by our own Vice-Consul Armstrong who speaks of the imposition in A.B.I.R. territories of a new poll-tax of 25 francs per annum. Now as the native received for 1 kilo. of rubber, of the market value of 8–10 francs, only 1 kilo. of salt, value 30–50 centimes, the imposition of this cruel tax meant the production of 4 kilos. of rubber per month—a practical impossibility for the wretched labourer, as it would leave him absolutely no margin of time to secure any adequate subsistence for himself or his family. Never in his opinion had the position of affairs with respect to Congo reform been more critical than at present, or the prospect of securing such reform more gloomy. In the first place, King Leopold had openly repudiated any British right of interference. In an interview with Sir Arthur Hardinge, M. de Cuvelier, the Belgian Minister, had used these words—

> "No foreign Power had any right to interfere with the internal administration of the Congo Free State."

Sir Arthur Hardinge had then asked whether, if King Leopold saw fit to establish a system of absolute and undisguised slavery, the signatory Powers would still possess no rights of interference, and the same answer had been returned by the Belgian Minister. Again, the constitution of the new Cabinet at Brussels could not inspire much hopefulness. Some of the Ministers appeared to be mere subservient nominees of the King, and others had direct financial interests in the profits of the Congo rubber companies. But the chief reason of his pessimism as to present possibilities of Congo reform was as follows. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had declared last July that "we cannot wait for ever"; how greatly he wished that the right hon. Gentleman could tell the House that evening "we can wait no longer." He feared that at any moment the King, through his subservient Cabinet, might secure the technical annexation of the Congo by Belgium on the same evil lines – the negation of all civil rights to the natives, the denial to the black of any right to the produce of the soil, his own labour, his wife and children, or, indeed, his own life. If the Congo were annexed on such conditions as those our difficulties would be increased tenfold. If we had found it difficult to deal with the private ruler of a State, of which we ourselves were, so to speak, a trustee, let the House think of the obstacles in our way if the Congo was governed on the same conditions by the Belgian nation, the neutrality of which had been guaranteed by the Powers of Europe! If that came to pass, he feared that the infamy of the Congo would become stereotyped and permanent. That present discussion on the Congo would perhaps be the last within the House of Commons, and the long series of Parliamentary speeches on the subject delivered by Members of different political parties since 1903 would remain in *Hansard* as melancholy monuments of futile enthusiasm and, he was bound to add, national discredit. King Leopold had recently appeared to abandon his attempts to justify the misconduct of his satraps on the Congo, or contradict the verdict of his own Commission. He had taken refuge in patriotism—the last resort of such a monarch—and his followers were indulging in violent abuse of the British Government and people for our supposed intention to override the "constitutional rights of Belgium." The Belgian apologists for Congo misrule adopted the *ad hominem* argument of recounting various instances of alleged misdoings on the part of Great Britain herself. A Belgian Minister had, for example, recently exclaimed in the Chamber, "We are not a Transvaal to be suppressed amid the protests of the civilised world." Well, he was quite ready to acknowledge that our own hands as an Imperial race were not wholly clean. He frankly confessed that since he had entered that House things had occurred in Egypt, Natal, India, and the Transvaal which, to some extent, shocked and disappointed his Radicalism: he regretted that recognition was so readily accorded to that mischievous fetish, the superior wisdom and humanity of the "man on the spot," and that at the recent Colonial Conference, wherein certain commercial advantages for a handful of Colonial farmers were discussed *ad nauseam*, no single word was uttered on behalf of the grievances, material welfare, or moral advancement of the King's black subjects in those self-governing Colonies. Nevertheless, all said and done, to compare our own failures and errors with the atrocious oppression of the Congolese natives was to lack all sense of proportion; it was in fact impossible, he thought, to find anywhere in history, ancient or modern, any parallel for this cruel and continuous exploitation of 15,000,000 of helpless blacks for the sake of private profit. At any rate we could say with the utmost sincerity that in this matter of Congo reform we were absolutely disinterested. If to-morrow morning the Congo State were partitioned between France and Germany, every Member of that House would greet the news with unfeigned delight. Of course private Members in that House could not help realising their impotence in these great questions of foreign policy and international ethics. They were like the rank and file of the Homeric armies who advanced "breathing valour" or "chattering like cranes," but contributed very little to the settlement of the great issues which were decided by their leaders. Nevertheless, he ventured to beg the Secretary for Foreign Affairs to use his best endeavours to bring about a conference of the signatory Powers. The moment might not be wholly propitious, but the possible alternative—Belgian annexation on existing lines—was too dreadful to contemplate. Nay, if the British Government declined to recognise any longer the flag of what was virtually a slave State, and tried the effect of a "peaceful blockade," he thought that the despatch of a single cruiser to the mouth of the river would speedily bring the monarch of the Congo on his knees. The Foreign Secretary had spoken as follows in 1904—

> "He did not think that any of the great European Powers, with the facts so clearly established as they now were, ought to be content in view of their own honour in the matter to sit still and do nothing."

If those words were true then, as they certainly were, they were *a fortiori* true now.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Foreign Secretary whether he thought there was any likelihood of Belgium taking over the Congo. He understood from answers that had been given that practically a promise had been given that a Bill would be brought into the Belgian Chamber which would carry out that proposal. Everybody realised the importance of the question and that the statements made with reference to savagery and cruelty on the Congo were quite true. There was no doubt that a large number of people had believed that those reports were very much exaggerated, but, although there might have been a certain amount of exaggeration, it was perfectly plain from the testimony received from Italy, France, Germany, and Belgium herself that the statements were true to a very great extent, and that at present there was an extraordinary amount of cruelty, tyranny, and savagery going on in the Congo. He would like, in confirmation of that statement, to quote to the House what appeared on 28th February last in *Le Patriote*, a Belgian Royalist and Catholic paper. An indignant editorial on the situation contained the following—

> "The rebellion in the A.B.I.R. territory extends. The Government itself forces the rubber, and delivers it on the Antwerp quay to the brokers of the A.B.I.R. . . . Nothing is altered on the Congo. The same abominable measures are adopted; the same outrages take place. . . . The Government is adopting the same measures as in the Mongalla, flooding the A.B.I.R. territory with soldiers to utterly smash the people, whom it thinks will then work, and the rubber output be increased. . . . The memory of these deeds will remain graven in the memory of man, and in the memory of Divine vengeance. Sooner or later the executioners will have to render an account to God and to history."

He believed that more than one Belgian paper corroborated the testimony to which he had referred. Many persons desired that there should be a conference in regard to the matter. It appeared to them that if there was a conference between Germany and France, taking into account the fact that France had a right of pre-emption, and if we were allowed to attend that conference with the United States and those other countries, there might be found some means of forcing Belgium to take action in the matter. He was very glad the debate on this question had taken place, and he sincerely trusted that the outcome might be some action which would lead to the cessation of the abuses of which they complained. The question had not been raised in any hostile spirit, for they all recognised that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had the interests of this country at heart in every particular. He sincerely trusted that the right hon. Gentleman might be able to do something for the benefit of the unfortunate people of the Congo Free State.

*SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said hon. Members in all parts of the House were grateful to the right hon. Baronet for having raised this discussion. The noble Lord the Member for South Kensington had contributed a thoughtful analysis of the actual situation in connection with the Congo. It did not seem to him that it would be useful to enter into the appalling record of the terrible condition of affairs in the Congo with which they were familiar, or to develop any arguments based on the special conduct of the Belgian monarch, which might tend to exasperate the situation in Belgium. He thought that all wise, thoughtful, and humane men who had studied the acknowledged facts of the question would be at one in wishing, without stirring up bitterness which might defeat their object, to find some practical suggestions which might lead to a termination of this chapter of horrors in the Congo basin. The noble Lord had said with perfect accuracy that annexation pure and simple, such as some Belgians were willing to agree to, might tend to bring about through publicity and discussion in the Belgian Parliament those checks upon ill-government in Africa which right-minded men would wish to see. The noble Lord had suggested that we should not insist on the conditions which the various treaties placed at our disposal.

*EARL PERCY: I do not think I suggested that.

*Mr. Pike Pease.*

*SIR F. CHANNING said he thought that the noble Lord rather discouraged the idea of the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean that we should insist on those general conditions of the Berlin and Brussels Conferences being observed, upon the basis of which the Congo State was explicitly formed. The noble Lord made a suggestion in regard to what really lay at the bottom of the whole matter, the economic position in which Belgium would find herself after annexation. His suggestion that the Powers should permit customs duties to be levied on imports into the Congo basin was of great importance, but if that would lead to a diminution of the trade they wished to see on the Congo River and the Congo basin it might defeat the very object he had in view. The very first means contemplated by the Powers for carrying out the policy of the civilisation of the Congo had been to throw it open to the legitimate trade of the whole world. They were all familiar with the experiences related by Sir Henry Stanley who stated his impression that the natives had splendid qualities for carrying on trade. He submitted that that was the true key to the solution of this problem if Belgium did annex the Congo Free State. What they had to do was to insist, as a solemn duty, on the conditions under which the Congo Free State was established, being carried out to the letter, and this opening to trade was the only way of accomplishing that purpose. It should be remembered that this country was not only responsible for the Congo State, it was responsible for the very existence of Belgium as a State in Europe; and that imposed upon us the solemn duty of supporting those Members of the Belgian Parliament who were endeavouring to work out a right and proper solution of the problem of the government of the Congo, and who were well aware of the terrible condition of things that prevailed there, and of the mendacious statements that were made in some quarters to disguise what had occurred. They need not exasperate the situation by criticising the action of the Belgian monarch; but what they might do in that House was to point out the enormous possibilities which a rational handling of the economic situation by the development of trade might bring about. A

European conference might be brought about. That should be their first aim, but if that were impracticable, there might be joint action between this country and the United States. President Roosevelt had solved more than one great international problem; and he thought that if President Roosevelt could, with the assistance of His Majesty's Government, bring pressure to bear on the Belgium Government on this matter, the result would be that they might face the difficulties of the future in that part of Africa. As he had already said, the key to the whole situation was to open the great area of Central Africa to free commerce, which would extend civilisation and give the natives that rational hold upon their own lands and rational interest in the products of their industry on which civilisation must rest.

*MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.) said he had listened with great attention to the various speeches which had just been delivered, but he had not been able to discover any sufficient reason why this debate should have been initiated under present circumstances. They were on the eve of the holidays, and the few hon. Members present were anxious to get away to other scenes and other occupations for a brief time. But certain Members of the House seemed to consider that that was a fitting occasion on which to arraign the rule of a friendly State, with the view of getting a judgment of that House upon it. He had read much that had been written and said in regard to the government of the Congo Free State. It struck him that the history of that State could be divided into three parts. The pre-Belgian period, the Belgian period before 1896, and the Belgian period after 1896. Up to the time of the journey through the territory by the late Sir Henry Stanley the map of Africa of that region was a blank. It was described by geographers as a jungle inhabited by savage wild beasts, and by men still more savage. Sir Henry Stanley found that there were great possibilities connected with it and on his return to Europe he did his utmost to awaken interest in it in this country, but signally failed. Sir Henry Stanley, however, found in Belgium a more sympathetic audience and succeeded in inducing the King of Belgium to take an interest in his scheme. Amongst other things King Leopold sent out a staff of officers who organised an army to cope with the slave traders. At the time when Stanley visited the country, the House must remember that those slave traders were in the habit of raiding the country, inflicting a loss of life calculated at 100,000 per annum. In addition a number of boys and girls were annually carried away into slavery. King Leopold, after a long and severe struggle, succeeded in smashing the power of these Arab slave traders and raiders and put an end to the system. The King also prevented the introduction of alcoholic drink which had wrought such havoc in other parts of Africa. He had spent millions of money, some of it his own money and some of it the money of his friends, in the construction of a railway connecting the upper and the lower Congo. He had also constructed landing stages, and placed fleets of steamers for service on the rivers and lakes. He had made provision for the establishment of Christian Missions which he (Mr. Nolan) understood were as successful in dealing with the natives as the missions in any other part of the world. In fact he learned that the system was so far successful that some of the natives who came under the influence of these missions and acquired some knowledge were able to preach religion among the savage tribes at some distance from the mission, and teach them what they themselves had learnt. Up to the year 1896 there were no words found sufficient to express the admiration of the civilised world for King Leopold while he was carrying out this great work at his own expense and that of his immediate friends. So long as there was no prospect of any monetary return for the outlay of the King there was not a single word uttered against him or his representatives; but in 1896 rubber commenced to be found in large quantities, and there were rumours also of the existence of gold in the Congo. A change at once took place. First, demands were made on behalf of an interested group of people in Liverpool that the Congo should be thrown open to trade. Rightly or wrongly, that demand was refused.

Possibly King Leopold and his advisers thought that, having expended millions of treasure in establishing public works, they should not allow independent traders from other countries to come in and carry on trade in a manner not likely to improve the condition of the natives or of the country. There were examples of what the introduction of private traders meant in some of our own Colonies in West Africa. From that time forward a change took place in the way in which King Leopold and his work in the Congo was spoken about, and no words could be found too abusive to apply to him. He thought the climax was reached when the ruler of a friendly state was described as being "an inhuman monster." But there was another side to the picture. On the occasion of King Leopold's jubilee a year or two ago he was presented with an address of a highly complimentary character by 600 English gentlemen living in Belgium, who had every opportunity of forming an opinion as to King Leopold's character. He had heard some of the speakers refer to meetings which had been held in this country at which King Leopold's rule in the Congo Free State had been denounced. One afternoon, there being no pressing business in the House, he went to one of these meetings, and heard a great deal of abuse of the Congo Free State Government. But not one word of evidence in support of the charges which were made was brought forward. One gentleman, who was active in making charges, was asked whether he could give any proof in support of them, and he produced several strips of ribbon with pieces of twigs attached to them, and he said those twigs represented people who had been murdered, a long twig being for a man, a shorter one being for a woman, and the smaller ones for children. He did not know what the others thought, but he thought this was rather trifling with the audience. Some years ago a gentleman connected with the Congo Reform Association did make a specific charge against an officer of the Congo Free State. What was the result? That officer of the Congo Free State brought an action against him, not in Belgium, not in the Congo, but in London, and the result was that the officer obtained a verdict with £500 damages and costs against that employee of the Congo Reform Association. It would be noticed that from that day onwards the lecturers of the Reform Association had carefully abstained from giving particulars as to these alleged outrages in the Congo Free State. What did the inquiries of the Consuls and Vice-Consuls who went out to investigate the state of affairs in the Belgian Congo amount to? The whole of their discoveries, as shown in the White-book issued a few days ago, amounted to this: that a British subject who was a native of Nigeria had been flogged by a Belgian officer for prowling about a camp at night. He believed the Congo Government called this Belgian officer to account, but that he died on his way to the coast to be tried. Notwithstanding that, compensation was given to the man who was flogged. In regard to that matter he would like hon. Members to think of what went on in India under the rule of the British Government. They knew that His Majesty's subjects were imprisoned there for long periods without being brought to trial, and were flogged every year by thousands for breaches of the law. If half of what happened under our own rule in British Possessions could be charged to the Congo Free State Government he could understand Members of that House rising up to denounce it. The Congo Government did not pretend that there were no abuses, but what they did say was that every effort was being made by the Government to put an end to those abuses. Were there no abuses in London? Here, in the heart of the British Empire, there was a Commission sitting to consider the administration of the police, against whom charges were made which were more terrible than any form of physical violence. If those charges were now being brought against the police of the Metropolis, it was not surprising that some of the officials in the Congo Free State, thousands of miles from civilisation, armed with modern weapons, surrounded by natives, should have been guilty of cruelty. But whenever a charge of that sort had been brought to the attention of the authorities the official was brought to justice for it. He knew that a number of Members of that House had their minds made up on this question. They had not heard, and did not appear to desire to hear, anything beyond one side of the question, and although the wild charges that were made were not supported by any practical testimony they were accepted as true. He noticed in the organ which had been specially started and run to make these attacks on King Leopold and the officials of the Congo Free State that from one end of the year to the other not one word of credit had been given to King Leopold or the Government of the Congo Free State for any of the good work that had been done. Cardinal Gibbons and other independent witnesses of the highest character, Catholic and Protestant, had vouched for the good work done there. But no notice was taken of evidence of that kind. Many people took it for granted that no charge against King Leopold and his Government could be too bad to be believed. They would not give attention to the other side. What happened in German Africa? King Leopold had never sent out an army to the Congo; he had sent out some European officers, not all Belgian, but some Italians, some Swedes, and a few English. Germany sent out an army supplied with arms of precision and plenty of ammunition to make war on the Hereros, and the slaughter went on for years; but there was no protest against that, and he supposed that if King Leopold had been the master of many legions there would have been no protest against what had taken place in the Congo Free State. But because King Leopold was the ruler of a small industrial State every kind of abuse could be poured upon him without any reproof by any person in authority. He had no personal interest in this matter direct or indirect; but he liked fair play, and since his attention had been called to this question he had read the evidence on both sides, and while he was prepared to admit that there were abuses in the Congo, yet he claimed, in the interests of fair play, that people ought to look not merely on the admitted abuses but on the great work being done there in the interests of Christian civilisation.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.) said he felt it was great cause for satisfaction that one more opportunity had been given for discussing this question. His difficulty in discussing it was that of approaching it from the attitude of anything like statesmanship, or to use language in regard to it that would be permitted in that Assembly. If ever there was a subject to which strong language was appropriate it was this. The hon. Member for South Louth had fallen foul of some Members of the House because they, in attacking the Congo, attacked the ruler of a friendly State. If he were tempted into that line of discussion it would not be very difficult to justify any attack which the hon. Member had attempted to repel, but which had never been made. The history of the Congo Free State showed that the missionaries were there long before the King of the Belgians undertook the civilisation of the district. The hon. Member had contrasted the action of King Leopold with that of Germany, who had sent out an army to another part of Africa. But the Free State had armed savages and cannibals. Had the hon. Member read the Belgian Commission's report upon this matter?

MR. NOLAN said that if the hon. Member for N.W. Norfolk had read it he would have found that while the Commissioners recommended certain reforms, they gave credit for the great work effected.

*MR. GEORGE WHITE replied that he had read it, and that it teemed with facts of the grossest atrocities on the very largest scale. He had never read in the whole history of the civilised world of atrocities to equal them. He had himself been over and over again in the company of men who had seen those mutilated natives, and he had heard their statements of how those terrible mutilations had been inflicted, and it was too late in the day for any hon. Member, in any circumstances, to get up and attempt to suggest that those statements were altogether manufactured for the purpose of getting up an agitation in this country. The evidence of the number of twigs as to the murders committed in certain districts, and the testimony of the men who had accepted those records from those who had knowledge of the deeds, were amply sufficient, and the hon. Member had no right to get up in that House and say that those statements were absolutely false.

*MR. NOLAN said that the records of which the hon. Member spoke did not look as if they had ever been in Africa; they could get them made in London by the waggon-load.

*MR. GEORGE WHITE said that they set up in that House and in the country a claim to being animated by a spirit of universal brotherhood. What a burlesque the whole thing was in the face of those gigantic atrocities! If natives under British sway had been treated in that way, hundreds and thousands being subjected to those cruelties, the whole Empire would have risen in indignation and demanded reparation. He thought, therefore, that they were bound to press upon the Government that they should take such steps as would bring about a termination of such gross misrule. The agitation had been going on now in this country for several years, and yet practically nothing had been changed. There was no proper administration in the Congo. An hon. Member had spoken of the slave trade having been abolished. He would venture to say that a great number of the natives of those districts had been subjected to influences which were worse than the slave trade as it was carried on before. The whole system of management was rotten to the core, and he thought that our obligations required us to take such steps as might be necessary to enable the Belgian people to understand that these things would no longer be tolerated. Many of the missionaries were in districts where the cruelties had been going on, but latterly it had become difficult for them to keep their position; yet even those who were a considerable distance away from the centre of maladministration had become acquainted with what was going on. He had said just now that there had been no change. He thought that there had been a change in one respect, that the district was getting rather too warm for the continuance of the missionaries, and attempts were now being made to prevent them from getting sites for their chapels where they could carry on their worship. He did not wonder at it. No British missionary could live in the districts where these things were going on without being compelled to report and protest against them. The missionaries were the first to protest against slavery in Jamaica, and they were the main instruments in getting that slavery removed. So now, in these days, unless they could support the missionaries in the demands they had made for freedom of worship, they would not get the information which they had a right to demand at their hands. It was for His Majesty's Government to say what were the steps which could be taken to put an end to these misdeeds. For his own part he felt that it was dangerous to consent without conditions to the annexation of the Congo Free State to Belgium. He had presented to the House a few days ago a petition from working men, the prayer of which exactly described the position which the nation ought to take up, and he thought the Government ought not to be behind public opinion. Like the hon. Member who had just spoken, he had attended one or two of the meetings which had been held in different parts of the country. He was bound to say that they had been perfectly unanimous; and he would like those who had been witnesses of these transactions, and gentlemen connected with the Congo Reform Association of Liverpool, to put the House in full possession of their statements, and then no man would doubt the truth of the statements, nor the sincerity of those who had spoken to them. The House had to consider the position which we occupied, having accepted the Declaration, which, of course, was accepted under the very specious promises of King Leopold. It was quite true that eleven or twelve years ago King Leopold was hailed as the saviour of the Congo, but that was on the strength of his promises, and those promises had not been fulfilled in any one particular, so far as he knew. Therefore, as a party to the Declaration, this country had a right to take a firm and consistent step, and he could not but believe that the other nations of Europe, which were quite as much interested in the condition of the Congo and desired to see these cruelties abolished, would join in any reasonable arrangement, first by calling a Conference, and then by seeing what were the steps which could be devised. He hoped that this nation would not consent to the annexation of the Congo to Belgium, unless under such conditions as would ensure some reasonable terms for these poor native races who had been so cruelly misused and ill-treated by their governors.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he had understood the noble Lord to say, though he must have mistaken him, that the British taxpayer would be called upon in certain contingencies to provide funds for the administration of the Congo.

*EARL PERCY: No, the Belgian taxpayer.

*MR. REES hoped, at any rate, that before long this country would be rid of a responsibility which it seemed equally unable to discharge or to evade. He did not wish to touch upon this question except in regard to what was said by the hon. Member for Woodstock, who had remarked that our hands were not clean but that other nations' hands were less clean in dealing with subject peoples. He was not concerned to appraise the degrees of dirt that might adhere to the hands of others, but he did repudiate the assumption that our hands were not clean. He remembered that the hon. Member for Woodstock referred to this question last year and said that British officers abroad regarded natives as *φύσεῖ·δουλος*, or born slaves. But on the other hand the hon. Member regarded the British officer abroad as *φυσεῖ τύραννος*, or born tyrant. Of the two creeds he would rather subscribe to the former than to the latter. His object in rising, however, was to ask the Foreign Secretary a question with regard to another matter that had reference to the contemplated communications between Anatolia and Persia, which, in point of fact, made a new road to India. The particular question of this so-called Baghdad railway was indeed a most important one, and the Leader of the Opposition, when he was in office, proposed, at one time, that we should actively participate in the scheme. He wished to ask, in reference to the increase by 3 per cent. of Turkish customs, which, as he understood, had been practically agreed upon, whether the funds which would be realised over and above what were required would be so earmarked that they could not be used by the Turkish Government as a guarantee to the German concessionaire. He was well aware that this was a German concession, but he believed that large funds would be raised in France, and hoped that in some way this country would be able to participate in the internationalisation of the scheme with which it was so intimately interested. If any great military power was in a position to bring troops down the Persian Gulf, the flank of our Indian Empire would be turned. The whole of the money we had spent in fortifying the North-west Indian frontier would be wasted, and we would be exposed to the attack of another and a strong military Power. He heartily acknowledged, if he might say so with respect, that the Foreign Secretary, as he understood, accepted the position of Lord Lansdowne as to the supremacy which we must maintain in the Persian Gulf. The Foreign Secretary had in no case departed from the wise and continuous conduct of our foreign affairs, which was the tradition of his office and of its distinguished holders. If the right hon. Gentleman could say anything about the matter he would be glad to hear what he had to state about the participation of England in this scheme. As to the action taken with regard to the Turkish customs, he believed that it had been engineered from first to last with the object, whether successful or not, of providing the interest on the funds to be raised for the prosecution of this German enterprise for a railway to the Persian Gulf. If arrangements as regards this increase in the customs had been concluded, it became necessary for the House to know that the Foreign Secretary, at any rate, had this aspect of the matter before him. He did not expect the right hon. Gentleman to make any great statement on the subject, but perhaps he would be able to say something. The question was admittedly an important one and to anyone who knew the region of Mesopotamia, and knew what it had been in the past, and what it might be in the future, it assumed quite international importance. We were interested in the matter in respect of the approach to our Indian Empire, and also because the settlement of the question would determine which Power was to dominate that portion of Asia Minor through which the rails would pass. Already the Sultan was preparing a scheme for making the land between the Tigris and Euphrates what it once was, the garden of Asia, and it might well be that in no long time a new significance would attach to that blessed word Mesopotamia.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I do not at all deprecate the fact that my hon. friend who has just sat down has put before the House his views on the subject of the Baghdad Railway, because I fully admit that it is a subject, or may become a subject, of considerable importance. But at the same time it is a subject with regard to which we have not got treaty rights, and with regard to which there does not exist that humanitarian and moral interest which attaches to the previous subject of debate, and is therefore one on which at the present moment I do not see how I can well make a statement without touching upon, in a somewhat presumptuous way, affairs which are in the hands of others. At the present moment the Baghdad Railway, so far as it has gone, is a matter of local interest, developing, no doubt, the resources of the country through which it passes, and possibly of interest to those who have invested money in it. What my hon. friend anticipates is that it will be so developed as to provide an alternative route to the East. I entirely agree with him that should that, or any other alternative route, be established it must be a matter of first rate importance, and of great interest to all those Powers who have possessions in the East, or who have possessions in the neighbourhood. I therefore do not in the least wish to detract from the impression my hon. friend has given of the importance of the subject named, but it is not one on which at the present moment I am prepared or indeed have a right to make a statement. Now, Sir, with regard to the main subject of debate, I should like first of all to put it on record that the intention of everyone who has spoken, I think without exception, has been to show a desire to avoid saying anything which might in any way reflect on Belgium or the Belgian people, or which might legitimately be taken as a matter of offence by them. I wish to say that very explicitly, because it is sometimes represented that the mere fact of a debate taking place in this House on the Congo State is something which ought to be resented as being directed in some way against Belgium. I am sure that nothing is further from the intention of those who have spoken, and I think we may go a little further now than we have ever gone before in regard to the feelings of Belgium, and say that as far as we are concerned we have hitherto been Belgium's best friends in this matter. Many of the Powers, or at least more than one of the Powers, may feel that it has a potential interest in regard to the Congo State, but no Power which has treaty rights or potential interests in regard to the Congo State has recognised the rights of Belgium so exclusively and so emphatically as they have been recognised by His Majesty's Government. I think that ought to be recognised in Belgium, because one cannot foresee what the developments of this Congo question may come to be, and the time may come when Belgium may regret that she did not recognise in time who was her best friend in this matter. I agree with the noble Lord that there must be a change of system in the government of the Congo State. Sooner or later that must come. It cannot go on under its present irresponsible rule, and I agree with the noble Lord that the reforms which have been promulgated, or I think any reforms, will not secure the changes we desire unless there be a change in the system of government in the Congo State. We can have any number of reforms, but what we desire is results, and the consequence at any rate of my experience at the Foreign Office is that the one point upon which those who desire Congo reforms have concentrated and ought to concentrate themselves is to secure not a mere list of reforms, but a change in the system of government in the Congo State. Now it seems most natural, and I think it will be generally accepted by the House, that that should take place by the government of the State being transferred to the Government of Belgium, responsible to the Belgian Parliament. Belgium has her rights in the matter, and that is the most natural way in which a change should be effected. I do not agree with what has been said by one or two speakers that the prospect of that change taking place satisfactorily is less favourable now than before. I think the right hon. Baronet who introduced the subject said that the new Belgian Goverment was less favourable to freedom than the previous one. I do not believe that to be the case. I believe that the present Belgian Government is anxious to approach the question with the desire to secure a satisfactory solution; but I admit that those who are interested in the question will naturally wait to see under what conditions annexation is to take place and what the scheme of annexation presented to the Belgian Parliament will be. I do not know what the schemes of annexation will be which the Belgian Parliament will be called upon to discuss; still less do I know what scheme the Belgian Parliament will approve. I wait therefore to see what the conditions will be, and what the scheme of annexation will be. Pending that time, I should be reluctant, as the noble Lord opposite was reluctant, to lay down definitely the conditions which must be satisfactory, for this reason. If the Belgian Parliament is to act in this matter as we should like to see it act, it must do so of its own free will, without interference and without pressure from outside, and if there be in the Belgian Parliament even a suspicion that there is a desire on our part to interfere with their action or to put pressure upon them so as to influence their action, it will undoubtedly be prejudicing the chance of a favourable solution of the question. What we desire is to see the Belgian Parliament approach this matter with its mind perfectly free and untrammelled, and concentrated upon the need for reform and with the intention to reform the Congo State. But if there comes pressure from outside or a suspicion of interference from outside, what will naturally be in the mind of the Belgian Parliament will be the distraction of thinking how it is to resist that influence and uphold their sovereign rights against outside interference; and that is why I said that if we wish to see a favourable solution of what is known as the Belgian plan and the Belgian solution of the question we must respect the rights both of the Belgian Government and the Belgian Parliament, and make it clear to them that they must deal with the matter absolutely uninfluenced and uninterfered with from outside. I agree with the noble Lord that if Belgium will act in this matter—that is to say, if the Belgian Government takes over the Congo State not with nominal but with real responsibility—I assume that will be the solution of the matter, because I cannot suppose for a moment that the Belgian Government would accept a nominal responsibility which would be merely a veil put in front of the old order of things, and, while having a nominal responsibility, would be content to allow the real control not to be in its own hands, and abuses still to go on behind the veil. If Belgium takes over that real responsibility then we shall have secured two things; one is that the governing authority of the Congo will no longer be the trader; and in the next place you will have publicity. If you have publicity, if you have a Government responsible to the Belgian Parliament, the effect of publicity will be such that the abuses which have hitherto taken place will not be able to live in the light to which they will be exposed. The noble Lord pointed out how serious the financial difficulty of Belgium might be in this matter, and he put forward a suggestion tentatively of his own as to a method by which relief might be given. It is one which I have not previously considered. If Belgium feels the task before her is likely to be heavy and burdensome, and is anxious by any method to approach the treaty Powers—the Powers who were parties to the Treaty of Berlin—with the object of finding from them some help or some means by which the task may be made less burdensome to her, we, at any rate, shall be very glad to listen to any proposals which she desires to make. So much as to what I hope will be the ultimate and satisfactory solution of the Congo difficulty—annexation by Belgium. The change of Government has been in part responsible for delay in this matter. I think it is only right and fair to say that now that that Government has lost no time in declaring its intention to annex we should wait for a reasonable time to see what progress is made, and what the conditions of annexation will be. That is my attitude at the present moment. But I would repeat again what I said in the House last year, that I do not think anyone can wait indefinitely upon this question. I have been pressed as to what should be done if the Belgian solution breaks down, if Belgium finds herself either unwilling or unequal to taking the matter in hand. Well, Sir, then of course it becomes an international question. I do not wish for one moment to diminish our sense of responsibility, but at the same time if a change of government in the Congo is to take place, if the State is to pass into other hands which will reform abuses, then that is not a responsibility which we are prepared to undertake. We will share our responsibilities with the other Powers, that is our political and diplomatic responsibilities, but we have heavy burdens on us already, and I am not anxious to see this direct burden of responsibility increased by further additions to territory. That a Conference of the treaty Powers or the Powers interested should meet we have always been willing. The United States Government has also expressed its willingness to approach this question from the same point of view. We gladly recognise that as a favourable step, and one which may perhaps bear good fruit. But two Powers are not enough to form a Conference by themselves. The late Government issued an invitation to a Conference and were not met with an affirmative answer. The noble Lord asks whether the conditions would now be more favourable for the summoning of a Conference than they were then. I am afraid that in the last year or two Conferences in general have not increased in popularity. I should not like to repeat that invitation till I had some assurance from other Powers besides the United States that it was one they would be willing to accept. If any sign is forthcoming that the Powers which were not ready for a Conference when last asked have now changed their opinion we should be only too delighted if they desired it to issue such an invitation, and still more pleased to accept it if other Powers desire to issue it. But the question of forcing a Conference—which I think was one of the phrases used in the debate—is another matter. I doubt whether a forced Conference would effect the results which we all desire. A Conference to which people go unwillingly is much more likely to add another to the European complications than to settle this or any other problem with which it is its object to deal. I can only say that we are most ready to join with other Powers whenever they are willing to find a solution of this question, and any other Power who desires to approach us will find us not only willing, but unselfish and disinterested. We have no designs, no ambitions, no desires of a territorial character with regard to the Congo State. We have one or two boundary questions pending, but apart from that we shall approach the question, as far as we are concerned, absolutely without *arrière pensée* and with the most disinterested mind. If there be other Powers who have rights with regard to the Congo State or who have interests they desire to assert or put forward, no one of them has anything to fear as far as we are concerned. I should prefer myself, on the ground of right and because it is the least complicated solution, that the Belgian Government should act strenuously and effectively in taking over the Congo State; but the present irresponsible Government of the Congo is one which I think the Powers who are interested, especially the neighbouring Powers, cannot continue to recognise indefinitely. It may become, if it has not already become, a pressing condition of danger to the neighbouring States. If things go on as they have been going on for the last two years the result will be that the Congo State will remain as it is, a huge territory, and will become one which is exhausted, impoverished, and full of discontent and restlessness. That cannot be a result which can be contemplated with equanimity by the neighbouring Powers. All that we ask with regard to the Congo now is that the present system of Government, with all the abuses which have been shown and proved to be consequent upon it, and which I fear are inseparable from that system, should come to an end and its place should be taken by something which can be respected and trusted to govern the country well and reform abuses. If the Belgian Government are prepared to proceed in the matter they will have no better friend than ourselves. Failing Belgian action we shall be glad to recognise, to encourage, and to further anything which will secure good government and the reform of abuses, and which commends itself to other Powers, especially to those who may have special rights or interests of their own in the Congo basin.

MR. WALSH (Lancashire, Ince) said he desired to draw attention to the condition of things prevailing in the Transvaal with respect to Chinese labour. There were a number of labourers there with no licences at all. [Laughter.] He noticed that some hon. Members on the Conservative Benches seemed to think that that was a matter for laughter. He was quite sure that if they searched their consciences they would not find that it was a matter for laughter. No matter that came before the public at the general election was more responsible for the disconsolate state of the Conservative Benches—not even free trade—than the question of Chinese labour, so that really from the political aspect of the question alone there was little occasion for laughter on the part of the occupants of those benches. But even they, the authors of the whole system, stated in 1903 and 1904 that the system, if it was brought in at all, was to be temporary and transitorial. It was admitted also that no coolies should be brought into the Transvaal unless they were properly licensed. There were now 259 people there without any licences at all. No licenses had been issued for them. [Cries of dissent.] If they had been issued, it had been after the event. He wished to call the attention of the House to the excuses—they did not seem to him to amount to reasons—that had been given for the presence of these people there. It was said that owing to an error in the counterfoil of a small book the figures had been inaccurately stated. He supposed that was a book kept by some person whom nobody could trace, and for whom nobody was specially responsible. One side contained the number 553, whereas the real number should have been 246. He knew from his own experience that figures were the most perplexing of human inventions, but he could not understand a mistake of that kind. He did not think the House, or even the country, would mind the mistake very much if it were not one of a series of regrettable incidents. [AN HON. MEMBER: Was it a mistake?] Now that the Transvaal had obtained responsible government, he thought that everybody in the House hoped the mistake referred to was the last of the series of regrettable incidents. According to a Paper recently issued Lord Selborne was prepared to go bail for the officials under him. He did not wish to detract from the honour due to Lord Selborne for his readiness to stand by the officials. But who was to go bail for Lord Selborne? He could not forget that the whole of these regrettable incidents had happened during the time Lord Selborne had been at the head of the Government in the Transvaal. The noble Lord was the whole cause of the issue of 16,119 licences against the advice of the right hon. Gentleman who represented the Colonial Office in this House. He was there when the flogging took place with his knowledge, if not his connivance. Lord Selborne, in his opinion, was not altogether blameless in these matters. He and his friends only asked that the misgovernment which had been going on should now close, and that the constitutional freedom which had been granted to the Transvaal should not be infringed. The constitution had been granted on the distinct understanding that the contracts now in operation should cease at the end of three years, and that there should be no re-indentures. If there was to be Chinese labour in the Transvaal, it should only be in accordance with an ordinance sanctioned by His Majesty's responsible authorities and containing no servile conditions. He did not in any degree blame the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, to whom alone the Labour Members could address their observations on this subject. They had from the beginning recognised that his position was one of extreme difficulty. If they recognised the serious burdens and obligations they had to bear, and if their remarks seemed a little hard and severe, it was because they felt they were between the nether and the higher millstone. That position was liable to friction. They recognised that the situation might have brought about a great deal of trouble and friction, and if serious complications had not arisen it was largely due to the strenuous and statesmanlike way in which the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Colonies had dealt with the whole situation. It was not because he and his friends were ungrateful, but they believed that there might have been more of that supervision which had been promised and which they had a right to expect. It was to be hoped that this sordid chapter in our colonial history was coming to an end. He had seen a few ways ago in a leading Conservative paper that a deputation had waited on the Colonial Secretary with the view of inducing him to allow the Chinese to remain in the Transvaal until some other cheap labour should be obtained. But how did the case stand? The output of gold in the Transvaal in 1904 was £16,000,000. In 1906 it was £21,500,000, which enabled a dividend to be paid over the whole of 56 per cent. In 1906 one mine alone paid 180 per cent. on its shares. And all this time they were warning Englishmen not to come to the Transvaal! The number of white labourers in the Transvaal was becoming smaller and smaller every day, and all the predictions of Lord Milner were being falsified. The Labour Party hoped that the Government were absolutely determined that no more of the "regrettable incidents" to which reference had been made should take place in South Africa. If they succeeded in securing that, they would obtain the confidence of the people of this country.

*MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury) said he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Colonies when the Letters Patent enacting the constitution of the Orange River Colony were to be published. The House had been first informed that they would be published shortly after Christmas, and a few weeks ago the Under-Secretary had said that they would be published before Whitsuntide. It should be remembered that the right hon. Member for West Birmingham had said that the Orange River Colony was more entitled to have constitutional self-government than the Transvaal. The delay in announcing the conditions of the proposed constitution of the Orange River Colony had caused already anxiety and feeling in South Africa, and he hoped that his right hon. friend would make a statement as to the definite date when the Letters Patent granting the constitution would be made public. He hoped that the nominations to the Second Chamber would not be made, as was the case in regard to the Transvaal, before the political complexion of the Lower Chamber had been ascertained by popular election, but that the responsible Ministers would be consulted. The subject to which his hon. friend had referred was deserving of the notice of the House. A large number of Chinese coolies had been introduced into the Transvaal in breach of a deliberate undertaking given by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies. That undertaking was given because it was recognised by the Government and Liberal Party that the introduction of Chinese coolies involved very grave moral, social, and political considerations. The telegrams which had been published showed that there had been very gross carelessness in the way of management, but there was nothing to show that either Lord Elgin or Lord Selborne ever thought of the graver considerations, and the undertaking that the coolies should be sent back was thrown over simply because it might cost a few thousand pounds to carry it out. Lord Elgin had put his finger on the superintendent who was responsible for the gross carelessness which led to the miscalculation of the number of the coolies licensed. But that superintendent had not received any punishment. In fact he had received a very strong commendation from Lord Selborne. Yet that was the same man who a year ago was condemned by a Judge of the High Court to a fine and severe censure for illegality and cruelty to Chinese under his care. Had anyone who was appointed to look after and supervise the system of the Chinese employment in the compounds been reproved? The whole of those men remained, so far as they could learn, in the Government service. It should be remembered that it was on the very eve of the resignation of the Imperial Government that they brought in a fresh lot of Chinese to whom the great bulk of the people of the Transvaal—as they well knew and as the elections had shown—most strongly objected. And they were brought in without the slightest investigation as to what their legal position would be. He had asked questions on this point. Were those Chinese coolies kept in the compounds without the slightest legal warrant? And were they in the compounds in excess of the number which the late Government said over and over again they would not allow? The Colonial Office seemed equally ignorant of and indifferent to those matters. It was true that that matter had now passed out of the purview of the British Parliament into that of General Botha and his colleagues, and he had not the slightest doubt that they would deal with the question drastically. His right hon. friend had tried to dismiss that matter as one of mere historical interest, but did he mean to suggest that a question of that kind should, because it happened a few weeks ago, cease to be a matter of practical importance? And did he think that his own undertaking given to the House, and the breach of it, could be dismissed in that light and airy way? That could not be treated, and ought not to be treated, as a matter of no importance. In the near, or in the distant future, as he thought in the near future of a general election, when men looked back to the political annals of that time, they would be glad to find that there was an earnest band of Liberals in that House and out of it who thought it was their duty to protest against that system, and although they were not at first successful, that after a long and painful struggle, by the help of their new Boer and British fellow-subjects in the Transvaal, they had finally turned that cursed system out of the Empire.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): I do not complain of the two speeches which have just been delivered; I think they show the cooler atmosphere in which we are now enabled to discuss this South African question. I recognise the spirit in which hon. Members speak of the manner in which I have endeavoured to explain to the House of Commons the policy which Lord Elgin has adopted, and for which he, as representing the Cabinet, must necessarily be responsible. This incident of the introduction of 259 coolies is an inconvenient and unwelcome feature. It arises from a pure error, from an error of the most innocent and fortuitous character, committed a long time ago by a subordinate official beyond the reach or immediate purview of the High Commissioner. My hon. friends have inquired whether we have taken any steps to punish the official who was guilty of making this inconvenient and vexatious mistake. As I understand it, a reprimand has been administered, but I deprecate, and will always deprecate, the undue penalising of individuals who may make lapses in their public service just because the circumstance of their fault is connected with some matter in which the House of Commons takes a particular and special interest. I am sure my hon. friends will realise that, however irritating this error may be, there is no bad faith about it; and, as there is no bad faith about it, I am not disposed to admit that we have broken, in substance or in spirit, any pledge which I have given to the House of Commons. The pledge which I gave was in answer to a supplementary question, and what I had in my mind when I gave it was, not the accidental or fortuitous importation of coolies, but some deliberate and purposed attempt on the part of those who were concerned in the importation of Chinese coolies to bring in a large number beyond the number sanctioned by the House. The distinction is, perhaps, a fine one, and I do not dwell too strongly upon it; but I think it is sufficient, at any rate, to clear me, in my own mind, of having failed, even in the most minute detail, to satisfy the House in regard to the undertaking which I made. No one can pretend that the accidental importation of 259 coolies raises any question of principle. I wish the mistake had been the other way, though that was hardly to be expected. The full correspondence on this subject which I have laid before the House will, I think, show to any, I will not say reasonable or practical man, but to any dispassionate critic the very great seriousness which the Government attach even to an unpremeditated statement in answer to a supplementary question, and the great expense, trouble, and exertion which they are prepared to make to give full effect to any such undertaking as may be given. But I think the House will wish that in dealing with such matters we should be guided by practical considerations of expense and of difficulty, and that, at a time when so many large issues are moving smoothly and harmoniously to their conclusion in South Africa, we should have done wrong to have thrown this particular incident into an altogether disproportionate position. My hon. friend has asked who is prepared to go bail for Lord Selborne. The Government are prepared to go bail for Lord Selborne. Lord Selborne is an officer of State employed under His Majesty's Government. While he holds office under His Majesty's Government we are responsible for what he says and what he does, and we must be judged harshly or well by the House without being separated from him in any way. When I say that, I do not pretend for one moment that Lord Selborne's views on South African affairs are the same as those which the Government and their supporters have held. There are, admittedly, divergencies and differences which have never been disguised or concealed; but I say with seriousness to the House that we have been greatly benefited in the policy which we have carried out in South Africa by Lord Selborne's presence in the country. And at the time when we introduced the Transvaal Constitution in the summer of last year, Lord Selborne came forward and voluntarily from that moment associated himself with the dispositions and the constitutional arrangements which we were making, and by so doing enormously steadied public opinion in this country, and rendered the reception of that Constitution much more composed than it would otherwise have been. I have no doubt whatever that the great advantages which we have derived, and which we shall continue to derive, from his presence in South Africa fully justifies the co-operation which has been maintained between him and His Majesty's Government during the period in which we have been responsible for the direction of affairs. I will ask my two hon. friends not to dwell unduly on the gloomy side of things. I think a little optimism may be indulged in nowadays about South Africa, and I think that, instead of heading a search party to penetrate into the recesses of the South African mines in search of the exact legal *status* of these unfortunate 259 coolies, my two hon. friends will be better advised if they turn their eyes to the horizon upon which the smoke of the steamers is already visible which are to carry away the first batches of Chinese back to their own country. While I do not complain that this matter should be raised, I deprecate any very long or particularly heated debate taking place on it at the present time. The new Government is fully competent to deal with the question. Above all things it is important to our relations with that Government that we should not "nag" it, that we should not fidget from day to day about its affairs or how it conducts them. We shall repose confidence in a Parliament freely elected, and in a Government thoroughly representative of the majority of that Colony. Their problems are problems of the utmost complexity. My hon. friends have spoken of the great wealth of the Rand. Indeed, it is a wonderful thing that, with this fountain of £24,500,000 bubbling up every year in the midst of a comparatively small community, there should be, on all sides, distress and financial embarrassment, actual want of food and employment. It is a grave, complex problem with which these Ministers have to deal, and His Majesty's Government have great confidence that they will show themselves not unequal to the problem. A declaration of policy will be made when the Transvaal Parliament assembles. I do not want to anticipate—I would not if I could—what that declaration of policy will be. It would be presumptious on our part to attempt, beforehand, to dictate as to the deliberations of a new Parliament or to outline the policy which the responsible Colonial Government will expound. I do not know what their policy will be on Chinese labour. I know what I hope it will be, what I think it will be. All I know is what the policy of His Majesty's Government will be. It will be a strict and exact observance of the pledges which are recorded in the speeches of the most important Ministers of the Government and which are borne on the face of the Letters Patent. With regard to the Orange River Colony, the Letters Patent will be laid before the House almost immediately after we assemble after the Whitsuntide holidays.

**Mr. LYTTELTON** (St. George's, Hanover Square) said he had only one remark to make with regard to these 259 Chinamen. He thought that to punish a subordinate official for a clerical error would be a peevish and almost a malicious thing to do. He entirely agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary that it would be a great scandal to impose such a punishment simply because it was in the interest of Party politicians. It would also have been manifestly ridiculous for the Government to have incurred the expense of £12,000 in repatriating those 259 men. Hon. Members must remember very well that the Government refused, not to repatriate 16,000 coolies who had come into South Africa under licence in 1905, but to revoke the licences of those men before any expense whatever had been incurred and before a single Chinaman had been put on board a ship. Manifestly, therefore, it would have been ridiculous for a Government which was unwilling to do that to incur this great expense in repatriating Chinamen who had entered South Africa in error. The circumstance that interested him in the matter was that it had on all sides years ago been represented that the Chinamen were going into slavery. Tested by the facts with with regard to these 259 Chinamen, how was that case made out? The House was told in the documents presented to it that these coolies would be so indignant at not going into slavery that if they were repatriated a riot might be anticipated. They were assured by the representatives of the Government in that House, who had so often made these charges there and elsewhere, that £12,000 would have had to be expended in order to indemnify these Chinamen for not going into slavery.

MR. CHURCHILL: That was not my statement.

MR. LYTTELTON said that was the statement made in the White Papers.

MR. CHURCHILL said the right hon. Gentleman must not suggest that he was the author of those statements. It was his duty to lay before the House the statements that had been made, but whether he must be assumed to agree with the statements contained in any letters he laid before the House was quite another matter.

MR. LYTTELTON admitted that that was a fair explanation and he accepted it. But those were statements of Lord Selborne and Mr. Jameson. The Government were responsible for repatriating these Chinamen, and the ground upon which they refused to do it was that the Chinamen would riot against not being sent to the Transvaal unless they were paid a heavy compensation for not putting these fetters upon themselves. That was all he desired to call attention to. It was all on a piece with the rest of the evidence which had been put before the House. On the first occasion the question came up it was stated that $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. refused to be repatriated at the Government's expense, and on the next they were told that the Chinamen would riot if they were not allowed to put on these manacles of which they had so often heard.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said he desired to call attention to the new rules passed at Easter. He complained that the constitution of the Scottish Committee had not received adequate discussion. The new rules were passed *sub silentio.* He did not hold the Government responsible for their being passed in that manner, because it might have been possible for them to have been properly discussed if the hon. Members on the Opposition benches had shown a little more genuine interest in the matter. He expressed regret that the Scottish Committee was not composed entirely of Scottish members. A resolution was passed last April, at the convention of Royal Burghs held in Edinburgh, which expressed the wish that a Scottish Grand Committee might be set up which consisting entirely of Scottish members with power to deal with the Committee stages of Scottish Bills. The Scottish Liberal Association had also endorsed that view, which was generally held in Scotland. His main object in rising was to let the people in Scotland know that the Committee as at present formed fell very short of what they had hoped for. He ventured to say that even on the Front Bench there were members who were pledged on this subject, and he did not doubt for a moment that they were perfectly ready to give effect to the views which they had enunciated as to a greater measure of self-government for Scotland.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled on this Motion to deal with questions of legislation.

MR. PIRIE said he merely wished to show that there were members of the Government who had supported Home Rule for Scotland. In regard to the Scottish Grand Committee proposal, there were eight Amendments put down which, if they had been discussed, would have thrown a great light on the position of that Committee. They raised the questions of the number of members, the power to add members, the qualifications of members for the Committee, the appointment of Chairman, and other matters. But the Scottish Grand Committee as it was now constituted fell very far short of what the people of Scotland had been led to expect and of what they had hoped for. The view of Scottish Members on this subject remained absolutely unchanged from what it was in 1894, when the Scottish Home Rule Resolution was passed in that House. They accepted the Scottish Grand Committee for what it was worth, and as a temporary means of bridging over the pressure of business, but by no means as a final settlement of the question. The introduction of the Irish Council Bill ought to be followed before long by a similar measure for Scotland. They would watch the financial provisions of the Irish Bill closely in order to render them as economical as possible, in the hope that by saving the pocket of the British taxpayers support would all the more readily be given to the Scottish Bill when it was brought before the House.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) said that every time the right hon. Gentleman the Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, referred to the question of Chinese labour he seemed to derive great satisfaction from the fact that some few days before the end of his term of office he issued some 16,000 new licences suddenly and apparently without any special reason. Then they were told that the mere fact that these Chinamen did not wish to return to their country, and that, even before they landed, they understood the conditions under which they were to labour, was proof that the conditions were not in any way approaching slavery. He thought it was generally understood that slaves did not always wish for their freedom. It was within the range of possibility that men might be born under certain circumstances and conditions which were grafted into their nature, so that they failed to see that there was any disgrace or immorality about the position in which they were placed. He believed there was such a thing as cannibalism existing to-day. Missionaries and others had sometimes urged that the British should use force to put it down, but those who lived under those conditions had not that high sense of what was proper as between man and man which was to be found in civilised conditions of life, and we had a right to insist upon such a practice being suppressed whether the natives themselves liked it or not. That was exactly the principle involved in the question of Chinese labour. It was not a question whether the Chinamen, as individuals, wanted those conditions. The sole question to be decided was whether, considering our ideas and our state of human development, we could give sanction to that system as part of our public policy. He did not think anyone could defend it on any grounds whatever. With regard to the state of public business, he had heard the subject discussed very vigorously within the precincts of the House during the last month or so, and he would like, if possible, to get some information as to the position of affairs to-day. Clearly the legislative programme of the session was not nearly so advanced as it was this time last year. To an outsider there seemed to be a want of energy, almost amounting to a want of foresight, in the conduct of business. Everyone noticed last session that things seemed to be going smoothly. Everyone seemed determined to do his share of the work and to assist in the conduct of business; but this session, he did not know whether it was the inertia of the Government—he could not believe that it was want of energy on the part of Members—the position of affairs did not seem nearly as favourable for a decent legislative output as at the same period last year. Members were as anxious to work to-day as they were on the day they were elected. It seemed to himself and his colleagues of the Labour Party that if the full programme was to be proceeded with an autumn session was absolutely essential. Yet no one seemed to be able to give them the slightest idea as to what were the intentions of the Administration in regard to the subjects that remained still to be dealt with. The direct representatives of labour—the trade union representatives—had to manage their business in such a way as to earn their living in the recess, and it was essential for them to know whether there was to be a sacrifice of the most important part of the Government programme, or whether they were going to adjourn, say, at the end of June, and sit again in October or the middle of September. For himself he much preferred the latter. He would be told that the reason the session was so backward was because of the autumn session last year, there not being time between the two sessions to enable Bills to be prepared in the way they otherwise would be. That could only be correct on two suppositions, neither of which would be very complimentary to the Government—first, that in spite of their large majority they could not calculate with certainty upon support except from session to session; or, secondly, that though they could absolutely rely upon support during the whole life of the Parliament, they had not made up their minds as to the problems they intended to solve or the policy they intended to pursue. If the Government had made up its mind as to what it wanted to do what was to prevent its draftsman from being employed in drafting Bills for the next session months beforehand? It seemed a simple business to a man engaged in the ordinary affairs of life. It seemed to him that if he could rely on his majority, he would not leave matters over from session to session, never thinking what was going to be done until the next session arrived, but that he would, taking for granted that he had the support of his Party, provided he carried out faithfully their policy, begin to prepare for the whole Parliament from beginning to end. He did not know whether Governments conducted their business on those lines or not, or whether they lived from day to day, like Mr. Micawber, waiting for something to turn up. It was absurd to contend that one session should end before the drafting for another session began. He would like to know whether it was the intention of the Government to drop a considerable portion of their programme and rise in August, and whether they were going to meet again in the autumn. If an autumn session was possible or probable it would be much more convenient if they knew of it early in the summer. He did not like to feel that they were going to sit on until August and then be called back again in September or October. The session was now so far advanced that he thought they were entitled to have the views of the Government upon the point.

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth) said he sympathised with the object of the hon. Member for Stoke-on-Trent and shared his enthusiasm for progress; but with longer Parliamentary experience the hon. Member would appreciate the difficulty in carrying on proceedings upon business lines such as he suggested. The remarks of the hon. Member for Aberdeen referred to one of the most important points in procedure. He regretted that there was not a fuller House to hear what the hon. Member said, because this question of Grand Committee procedure was certainly one of the most important subjects that could be brought before the House. He agreed that the Government had given to the consideration of the Rules of Procedure all the time that it was possible to give compatible with the business of the House. As an English Member he was inclined to think there were strong reasons why Scottish legislation should not be withdrawn from the purview of the House. Scotland, sometimes spoken of as a field for legislative experiment, had often given a lead in sanitary and other legislation which England had followed, and it was extremely important that English Members should have the opportunity of following the discussions in the Scottish Committee. On the memorable occasion when the property of the Free Church of Scotland was by a decision of the House of Lords transferred to a minority in the

Highlands, the House undertook legislation on the subject, and the importance of the discussion was apparent to anyone conversant with what was going on in the Church of England and who might think that to some extent the positions were parallel. Again, it was possible that the Land Tenure Bill for Scotland might form a model for legislation to be applied to this country, and it was desirable that English Members should become acquainted with the arguments used in Committee. The discussions in Grand Committee would take the place of discussions in Committee of the Whole House, but they had not the same publicity. He therefore suggested that arrangements should be made for a verbatim report of the proceedings, or for a record similar to *Hansard*. It must be apparent that those Committees, on important measures, would take the place of the Committee stage of that House. He was aware that his right hon. friend had given a pledge that when the Scottish Bill came up on Report greater latitude would be given for discussion than was originally proposed. He was sure it would be a great help to English Members if they could get the proceedings of the Scottish Committee placed on record, so that the very valuable arguments upon such intricate questions as those involved in the Scottish land question might be open and accessible not only to hon. Members, but in future years to those who desired to study the question with a view to possible legislation in this country.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) said the observations of the hon. Member for East Toxteth were somewhat belated; they appeared to be a remnant from the long discussions upon the Procedure Rules in which the subject was fully considered. He took the machinery of business as a whole. The minute points in a Scottish Bill were discussed in Committee of the whole House in the absence of English and Irish members who voted upon occasion without knowing the a. b. c. of the matter they were dealing with. Scottish members were conscious of this atrociously bad method of conducting business, and the committal to a Scottish Committee was a change made for the better. English members would give or receive enlightenment on the return of a Scottish Bill to the House. The hon. Member desired there should be verbatim reports of the Committee proceedings; but the effect of that would be elaborate speeches which would be a drag on the progress it was hoped would be made by the change. There were reports in newspapers quite sufficient to enable members to follow the proceedings, and they must be content with those reports; he could not accept the suggestion for a further record. The hon. Member for Stoke had made a speech which, whether intended or not, was about as uncomplimentary to the Government as could possibly be made, and to himself as head of the Government especially.

MR. JOHN WARD: No, no.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said it implied that the Government conducted business in a haphazard way, not looking beyond their noses, upon the principle that sufficient for the legislative day was the business thereof, and that the Government ought to look much further ahead than the session. His hon. friend seemed to ignore the fact that the necessities, the views, the desires of the constituencies and the country changed with the changing seasons. Often a matter that was of the first importance one year, if not dealt with, sank the next year into insignificance. They could not be guided by any fixed plan extending over a good many years. The Government had declared themselves at the general election, and on other occasions, in favour of certain changes, both social and political. They had not departed from their desire to effect those changes; but the order in which they were to be taken up must, of course, be left to be decided year after year. His hon. friend had also raised the old familiar question of the part of the year over which the session should extend, whether they should adjourn at the end of June with a view to meeting again in the autumn, or whether they should sit on, as they had been accustomed, for the most part, to do in the past, well into August, rather than have an autumn session. That had been a subject of controversy during the whole of the thirty-eight years he had had the honour of having a seat in the House, and, though he would not positively swear to it, he must have changed his mind in regard to it, if not thirty-eight times, certainly many times in the course of those years, there were so many advantages in each proposal when it was looked at by itself. But that was not the occasion when the Government could lay down any general arrangements of that sort. His hon. friend had implied that the Government were behind with their business, and it had been alleged by someone that that was owing to the autumn session of last year. What was true of the autumn session of last year was that the Government—or, in similar circumstances, any Government—were naturally not so well prepared with their Bills this session as they would have been had there been no autumn session, not because they themselves had been taking too much holiday, but because the officials of the various Departments had been so occupied in watching, and nursing, as it were, the current legislation of the autumn session that they were unable to give the final form, under the direction of the Cabinet, to the Bills of the present session. But, except in that respect, the Government were not at all behind with their business. So far there had been thirty-four full days and eighteen half-days—that was, days ending at 8.15—devoted to Government business. Six full days and one short day were spent on the Address; in Supply, thirteen full and seven short days; on the Patents Bill, one short day; on the Budget, four full and three short days; on Procedure, four full and two short days; on the Army Bill, four full days and one short day; on the Irish Council Bill, one full day; on a number of small Bills one short day; on the Landholders (Scotland) Bill, two full days; and on Motions for the adjournment, two half-days. The result was that they had in that time got the Second Readings of the Finance Bill, the Army Bill, the Butter Bill, the Patents Bill, and the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill; and the Irish Council Bill had been introduced, and most important procedure rules had been passed. As to the future prospects of the Government measures, that was not an occasion on which he could make any statement. The innocents were not yet ripe for massacre. He fully appreciated the saying of his hon. friend, that it would be a great convenience to Members generally if they were informed definitely as to the period of the year when they would be required to attend Parliament. The whole of that question was in a somewhat fluid state at present, and he did not think that anything could be said just now even with respect to this year. As he had announced at question time, the Government were anxious, if possible, to avoid an autumn session, not only on account of its inconvenience to Members, but because it occupied the attention of the officials of the Departments to the prejudice of the business of the session that was to follow. But that was a question the Government had yet to consider. He could only say now that they had every hope and determination of proceeding with the greater part of the measures that had been introduced, if not all of them; and they trusted the House would assist them in so doing by refraining from any extreme prolixity of debate, so as to give them the necessary time. He could quite understand that Members who had not been long in the House, who entered it full of desire to pass useful measures, should, in the circumstances, feel disappointment, and chafe at the slow progress of things. He had always set his face against much time being spent in purely Party debates and in Second Reading debates on a large scale. It had been considered below the dignity of a first-class measure to give fewer than four or five days to its Second Reading. When the House entered upon that process the more reasonable Members took a holiday, returning in time for the division, and often there was the greatest difficulty in keeping up the debate for the required period, Members on both sides being urged to speak so as to keep it going. He was strongly against that sort of thing, for his own sake as well as for the sake of the progress of business, though he fully recognised that there should be ample time given for the discussion of important questions. His hon. friend the Member for North Aberdeen had complained that the Scottish Grand Committee had been created without discussion. He agreed there was substance in the complaint, but the guillotine had to be applied if the thing were to be done at all. Would his hon. friend vote for cancelling the Resolution which appointed the Scottish Grand Committee? He was sure he would not, because it gave to the Scottish people a power over their own affairs and the opportunity of having their opinions and desires expressed which they had never enjoyed before, except in two years which he remembered, when there was a Scottish Committee of the same character, and which answered the same purpose. He trusted the experience of the session would show that these Grand Committees had been the means of contributing good useful legislation to the Statute-book. The Government were anxious to get the affairs of the House into regular order, and, as far as possible, to meet the convenience of Members, so long as it did not trench upon the rapid despatch of the business which they were sent to Parliament to discharge.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he regretted the right hon. Gentleman did not see his way to have the proceedings before the Grand Committee reported. He thought the experience of the last few weeks in Grand Committees was not particularly hopeful. The public were absolutely ignorant of what the proceedings before those Committees were. The right hon. Gentleman had said that they must look to the newspapers for reports; but the readers of newspapers only looked at the report of the Parliamentary proceedings, and never thought of looking at any paragraphs in regard to what took place in Committees. At any rate, there was no official record of the proceedings of those Grand Committees. In the case of the Merchandise Marks Amendment Bill, introduced by the hon. and gallant Member for Sheffield, the Committee met and had to be adjourned owing to the necessary absence of the President of the Board of Trade at the Imperial Conference. All that added to the strain on Members, which was very serious indeed. The Opposition were justified in complaining of this addition to Parliamentary work, for, owing to the paucity of their numbers, every Member of the Party now served on some Committee, and some on two or three. As a consequence of the constant morning work on the Committees beginning at 11.30, and the lack of a dinner interval in the House, the strain upon Members was immensely increased. He did not suggest that they should revert to the longer adjournment, but he thought that an interval of twenty minutes or half an hour would be a great advantage. Apart from the relief to Members to enable them to obtain some dinner, it would give an opportunity to the servants of the House to tidy up the Chamber, and have it thoroughly ventilated. During the hot weather last year the atmosphere of the House manifestly suffered from the lack of such an opportunity, and the health of Members suffered in a corresponding ratio. Right hon. and hon. Gentleman opposite could go away to dine when they pleased; those on the Opposition side of the House could not. They were a small party. Ministers had shown clearly enough that they valued for themselves an interval for dinner. In the session of last summer, from April 24th, when the change was made, he had computed the attendance of Ministers from 7.15 p.m. to 10 p.m. from their participation or otherwise in the divisions—the only effective test which could be applied. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was absent from 59 per cent. of the divisions taken during those hours. The President of the Local Government Board, who was, perhaps, most regular in his attendance in the House, was only absent from 9 per cent. of divisions in those hours. He would leave out of account the Leader of the House, of whose engagements they did not know. The Under-Secretary for the Colonies was absent from 56 per cent. of the divisions in those hours; the Chancellor of the Duchy from 70 per cent.; the President of the Board of Trade from 52 per cent.; the Secretary for India from 60 per cent.; and the Secretary for Scotland from 65 per cent. Those figures showed that right hon. Gentlemen opposite valued the dinner hour between 7.15 p.m. and 10 p.m. He made an appeal on behalf of what he believed to be the bulk of the House that a reversion should be made to the old system of having a general dinner interval. He did not believe that public business would suffer in any degree from such an interval. He would not press the right hon. Gentleman as to whether there was to be an autumn session or not since the right hon. Gentleman had given a promise that in two or three weeks he would make a statement in regard to that subject. He would point out that an autumn session was incompatible with prompt legislation.

Question put, and agreed.

Resolved, "That this House at its rising To-morrow do adjourn until Thursday the 23rd May."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

---

## HIGHER EDUCATION.

MR. SILCOCK (Somersetshire, Wells) rose to call attention to the administration of education other than elementary in England, and to move—"That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that further encouragement shall be given by the Board of Education to those schools which have, since the Act of 1902, been classified as other than elementary, and that the principle of public local control should be extended to all schools other than elementary and to training colleges which receive help from public funds, at least to the extent of securing adequate local public representation on the governing body; and, further, that all schools and training colleges assisted by public funds should be freed from all sectarian tests for teachers, scholars, or members of the governing body." He said that he did not intend to deal with the question of elementary education except to say that the present position of that subject excited deep dissatisfaction in the country. Secondary education, according to the Report of the Board of Education for the year 1906, was the most important educational question of the present day, affecting as it did the efficiency, intelligence, and well-being of the nation. It was, however, described in that Report as being in a state of chaos, and the object of his Resolution was really to ask the Board of Education to take steps to bring order out of that chaos. There were nearly 5,000,000 of children between the ages of seven and fourteen in the schools of the country. A fair proportion of them might be expected to avail themselves of higher education if the opportunity were given them. Every year there were in schools 600,000 children reaching the age of twelve, and some provision should be made for their education other than elementary. They ought to expect that a considerable proportion of those children would be prepared to avail themselves of any opportunity given to them, but the provision was wholly inadequate. In Scotland every child up to the age of eighteen had efficient and suitable education free of charge and under public control. Let the House contrast that with the position of affairs in England. The total number of children in secondary schools or in schools which were not public elementary schools was under 1,000,000, and excluding those in the evening schools and in pupil teacher and training colleges, there were only 160,000 children in the secondary schools receiving public money. Every Member of the House must admit that that showed that the provision was utterly inadequate. The chief provision for secondary education was by means of scholarships given by education authorities, but only 14,000 scholarships were given in the whole of England. The conditions made by the Board of Education tended to keep the children of the working classes out of those schools. The fee of £3 should be abolished. The artificial distinction between elementary and non-elementary schools should be removed altogether. There should be a continuous system and no hard and fast line drawn between the two. Secondary education should be as much for the poor child as for the child of the upper and middle classes. Restrictions as to the number of free places should be removed, and the safeguards and restrictions now applied to elementary schools under which money was given should apply also to secondary schools that received public money. The Board of Education should encourage the building of new schools by local authorities and discourage the system of scholarships which was really a subvention to private schools. The principle of public local control should be extended to all schools in receipt of public money. They also wanted those schools to be free from all sectarian tests. In the past secondary education had not been so afflicted with the religious difficulty as elementary. Steps should be taken by the Board of Education to see that the religious difficulty did not find a lodgment in secondary education. The Board should always refuse grants to public teachers' colleges unless they had religious freedom within their walls.

They asked that the principle of religious freedom should be applied wherever money was granted to aid secondary schools. As to the general question of secondary education, he reminded the House that it was not a charity. It was, he contended, the duty of the State in its own interests to see that the children of the State were properly educated. If the State was to have better workmen and better citizens the education of the children must be carried a stage beyond that to which it was carried at the present time. The Imperialists who dreaded the competition of foreign countries might well remember Sir Lyon Playfair's remark to the members of the British Association that the competition between the nations of the future would be the competition of intellect. They looked forward to the time when men would be educated in this country, to whatever class they belonged, and when it would not be considered an anomaly for a man to be well educated because he happened to belong to the working class. They asked that the Government should take steps to put an end to the present waste of the nation's resources; to organise and bring order out of chaos; and to deal in a broad and comprehensive spirit with this question of secondary education. He begged to move.

*MR. ADKINS (Lancashire, Middleton) in seconding the Resolution, said that it, like many that had been brought before the House in the present session or the last, was not intended as a Resolution of censure upon the Government, but was meant to ventilate a great and important subject, to show to the Government and to the House what a strong public feeling there was on the matter, and to encourage the Government, in whom they had confidence, to take up the question and advance it, in spite of its difficulties, another stage or two towards the solution they desired. The problem of secondary education, although it was difficult, was most vital and pressing. The child who left an elementary school, in spite of all that had been done for him, had hardly begun to be educated. Many of the greatest advantages that came from education would not be gained by that child unless that education was supplemented. They felt that the nation itself, compared with other nations, was in a very large degree imperilled, if the bulk of those inhabiting the country did not get any education beyond that within the limits of what was called elementary. With regard to the last paragraph of the Resolution, which touched on the question of sectarian tests, the deliberate wishes of the House and he ventured to say of the majority of the people in the country could not for ever be thwarted by the action of the subordinate branch of the Legislature. The difficulties which attended the problem in regard to elementary education did not attend it to anything like the same extent when they were dealing with education other than elementary. They were dealing with lads and girls who were older, and to whom, therefore, the State during that period of their education was not so much in the place of a parent And in cases where there were endowments the true solution lay in the provision of hostels of a denominational character from denominational endowments, while all the scholars could share in the general teaching of the school. The central part of the Resolution referred to the question of encouraging education other than elementary and the question of extending the principle of popular control. Before the Act of 1902 a good deal of education was conducted by school boards and other authorities as a higher kind of elementary education, a kind which under that Act must now be described as secondary education. The effect of that Act, whether intended or not, whether merely transitional or not, had been in many parts of the country to distress, hinder, and arrest that higher elementary, or lower secondary, education which in many places was flourishing greatly to the public advantage before the Act was passed. He would give an illustration from the constituency which he had the honour to represent. In the town of Littleborough there was an elementary school which had a great deal of local support and in which the inhabitants took great interest. It was extended upwards in ways which, he dared say, were not according to Cockerton, but which were of local advantage and aroused a great deal of local enthusiasm. That form of education was given in the same buildings and to a large extent by the same teachers. The effect of the Act of 1902 upon that institution was this. Promising young people were told that there was a grammar school at Manchester fifteen miles away and another at Todmorden, an interesting fact to a few but not so interesting to many of the people who sent their children to that school. Orders were sent out by the Board of Education that a wall must be built between the part of the building in which strict elementary education was given and that in which the secondary education was given, as if it was a fever hospital where isolation was necessary. Suggestions were made as to fees which were most embarrassing to those interested, and the result had been for the time at all events to injure if not to kill the local enthusiasm for something better than ordinary strict elementary education. Matters like that were a public evil. In this country people could not be driven and dragooned into better ways. They might be led, and, as he had ventured to say before, would go still further if they were taken by the hand. The policy of the last five or six years, though perhaps only a temporary one, had been to hinder and prevent further development of what in many cases was a valuable kind of education. In the desire to foster secondary education of a higher type there was, no doubt, one practical difficulty realised by all educationists, which was that a boy whose education was to last until he was sixteen had to be caught young and passed through a curriculum which differed in many respects from that given to a boy who was intended to leave school earlier. It was certainly most important that all that was best in our old secondary education and those traditions which with all their faults had been bound up with the civilisation of our country should be retained, diffused, and extended, and the policy advocated by the Resolution was that the education hitherto enjoyed by the few should be purified, made better, and handed on to the many who had had up to the present no opportunity of getting it. He understood the wish of the Department to maintain and extend education of a high type which this form or method of curriculum might help, and a great deal might be said for it, but alongside of that educational policy was a great educational danger. If in order to secure such a curriculum they so exercised their administrative powers as to widen the gulf between the few who could and the many who could not attain to it, they were likely to do more harm by the social effects of their policy than good by reason of the valuable educational advantages which it possessed. If secondary education was to flourish, if the House was prepared to vote more money for it, if they were to have support from the local rates along with the local self-government which must follow, it was necessary surely to enlist the sympathies of people generally, and, most of all of that great bulk of their fellow-countrymen who up to now had been content practically with merely elementary education. Therefore it seemed to him that the pith of the problem was to combine the maintenance of that high standard and the preservation of all that was good in old educational tradition with the enlistment of the sympathies of the many, making it easy for the many and not merely the few, to get the benefits which he had described. How did the matter appear to many poor workmen in different parts of the country? They saw that their own children won very few scholarships. So far was the educational theory to which he had referred rigidly acted upon that those scholarships had to be won by the children at a comparatively early age. It did not always follow that the child who showed cleverness at an early age was going to be more worthy the higher education than the child which developed later. A workman's child won a scholarship and went to a secondary school, which was very often away from his home, and which was very often steeped in what was good in educational tradition, and also in what was not so good. The child was better educated perhaps, but when he returned home he was utterly out of sympathy with his parents and with the humble life from which he had sprung and in reference to which he ought to be qualified to give high and valuable service. He could understand the extravagant phrases which had been used with regard to this subject, and he could well imagine how the present conditions were looked upon as if the children of the poor must become either part of a horde of serfs or part of a handful of snobs; and it was precisely because that feeling was in the air, and because that was felt so strongly up and down the country, that some of them were anxious this session to ventilate the matter in Parliament, and if possible get the matter discussed in the House of Commons. What were the remedies? He ventured to suggest one or two on the lines of the Resolution. In the first place, in great towns they ought to have, at any rate, one large school in which was given both the education appropriate to those who were going to leave early, and the education appropriate to those who were going to stay longer. It might well happen that there were many parts of teaching which could not be given in common, but there were other parts which he was convinced could be given in that way. There were the elements of the history of our country, there were the beginnings of the knowledge of our literature, and matters of that kind, which ought to be taught with all that was best in the old traditions infused into them and taught to both kinds of scholars. Even if the plan involved largely duplicating the staff to meet the need of separate instruction in many subjects, it was still worth while to have both types in one school. To those who left at the age of fourteen and to those who stayed later, there was this advantage in being in one and the same school rather than in separate schools, namely, that if they were both in the same school they shared its life, wore its badge, and they had, as it were, two sets who met in the playground, where they learned to cherish the feeling that they belonged to the same school, and where they also learned that social distinctions were trifling compared with the true spirit of comradeship between young Englishmen. He suggested that that was one method that ought to be tried, because the want of sympathy with higher education and the class feeling connected with it which were now so prevalent were dangers to the State which it required enterprise and flexibility of method to deal with. In the second place it was surely possible to increase very considerably the local public control of every public school in which secondary education was given with help from public funds. There were some schools which received not a farthing from the rates, but were supported by old endowments, by fees, and by grants from the Board of Education. Even in those cases he would ask his right hon. friend to make it a condition of receiving the grants that there should be some representative of the local education authority. And for this reason among others: if the local education authority had been backward, if the local ratepayers were even more economical than ratepayers generally were, it meant that they had yet to learn the duty of spending money on this important matter, and if some of their number were allowed to go on the governing bodies of such schools, they would return to their councils interested in the work that had been done and anxious to strengthen local control and support the school from local resources. He had seen in his experience more than one case where the governors of a school which had no local support had been strengthened by the presence on their board of members of the local education authority. What had been the result? The school had awakened much greater interest, and the local education authority, after a time, became willing to help. When they came to those schools where help was given by the local authorities, he was sure that his right hon. friend required no suggestion and very little encouragement to strengthen the principle of popular local control, and those cases were bound to be more and more numerous as time went on, because unless support did come from local and Imperial sources, the problem of secondary education could never be solved. Then he submitted that that local control ought to be more of a reality than it was. He had received a letter that day from his friend the Chairman of the Worcestershire County Council, Mr. Willis Bund, a great administrator, who pointed out to him the important discussion his council was having with the Board of Education on this point, namely, that where the county supplied a considerable part of the money the county authority ought to have a considerable voice in the way in which that money was spent. He knew he was touching on delicate points of administration, but he unhesitatingly said that they would do well to bring about gradually, steadily, yet rapidly a system in which those elected by the people to look after local education should have a more quick and living interest and power in the administration of higher education. There was also the great question of endowments. In every county in England there were a considerable number of educational endowments, many, for instance, less than £50 a year. It was one of the many difficult matters which followed upon the Act of 1902, that those town and village endowments had to be settled with very great care by the Board of Education. The Board did show great care, but it frequently went into too great detail, deciding that half-a-sovereign had to go here and another small sum to some other purpose. He submitted that those endowments, at least those under £50, ought to be left to be used by the trustees, for any purpose of education other than elementary provided that the local education authority approved. They would thereby strengthen the local control over secondary education, and promote the much-needed flexibility of administration which would assist those who knew the local conditions, and yet who worked in a sufficiently large area not to be dominated by local prejudices. Those who brought this question before the House did so, not in any spirit of antagonism to the Government, nor with any aim which would tend to destroy educational machinery. They were most anxious that the benefit of secondary education should be extended as far as possible. They were most anxious that the mass of the people should no longer be alienated from secondary education in any way. Some part of their position might be founded on misconceptions; if so, let those misconceptions be cleared up. Some of their grievances might be founded on facts; if so, let those facts be altered. It might be that a change of policy or exposition of policy was required; for his own part he thought something of both was wanted. He hoped that the Government, in spite of their many difficulties and their great amount of work, would deal with this question. He was sure that the great majority of Members of that House, who by accident of birth and circumstance had been allowed personally to know something of what higher education meant, would desire that those who had been less fortunate in the past should be succeeded by a generation that should share in their advantages, and that the humanising, helpful, and elevating tendencies of real education might be known throughout our streets and in the places where our people dwelt.

*SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University) said he did not think anyone could complain of the substance or tone of the speeches which had been made by the two hon. Gentleman who moved and seconded this Resolution. The Resolution contained three propositions—(1) that it was desirable that further encouragement should be given by the Board of Education to secondary education; (2) that schools receiving State aid should be brought more definitely under public control than they were at the present time; and (3) that such schools, including training colleges, should be free from all sorts of religious tests. He did not propose in the very few remarks he intended to make to refer at any length to the third of those propositions. He must say, however, as regarded the first proposition that he was in complete sympathy with the mover and seconder of the Resolution. Those two hon. Members were quite correct in stating that there were few subjects at present before the country which were of more importance than the question of secondary education. At the same time, he would like them to bear in mind the fact that as regarded the question of the extension of secondary instruction it did not do to be in too great a hurry. They must remember that it was not yet five years since the Act of 1902 came into operation which placed secondary schools under the direct control of the Board of Education. He was not there as an apologist for the Board of Education, which would no doubt be represented by its President at a later stage in the debate. From his own knowledge of what the Board of Education had done he must say that it had always shown a sympathetic interest in all attempts which had been made to improve secondary education, and having regard to the difficulties of the work which they had to undertake he did not think they had been at all slow in the progress they had made. He thought, however, it would be very unfortunate, and in this he believed the mover and seconder would be disposed to agree with him, that the supply of secondary education should be in excess of the demand. What they had to take care of was that there should be among the working classes and among those who received the main part of their education at elementary schools a demand for that secondary education which the State was asked to offer. The people of this country required to be encouraged to see its importance. His own experience went to show that there was a lack of interest and desire among the working classes for the facilities which already existed. He asked the House to remember that it was not advisable to be in too great a hurry to multiply secondary schools before the demand for such instruction could be said to exist. It had been pointed out by the seconder of the Resolution that it was desirable there should be continuous education from the elementary to the secondary schools. He was in complete sympathy with that idea, but of course there was a difficulty in carrying it into effect, and that was due to a great extent to the character of instruction given in elementary and secondary schools. They should remember that as they advanced from elementary to higher forms of education the kind of education the children received tended to become differentiated. Elementary education was very much the same for all classes of children, but secondary education in all countries differed very considerably. He was quite willing to admit that it was somewhat chaotic at the present time in this country, but that was owing to the fact that secondary education had been under the direction of the Board of Education for so very short a time. When they compared secondary education in this country with what they found in Germany and other countries they were comparing it with organisations which had been in existence for decades. In all those countries where secondary education was well organised they would find different types of schools. It was very important, if children were to be taken from the elementary school into a secondary school of a particular kind, that they should be removed at an early age in order that they might receive the different kind of training afforded to them in the higher school. That was one of the difficulties which existed in the way of having a continuous scheme of elementary and secondary education. The difference was not entirely a social distinction, as people were very often inclined to imagine, but it was a distinction essential to the character of the education. The curriculum of any school must depend upon, and be regulated by the age at which it was probable the child would leave the school. If the entire education of a child or of the great majority of the children in a particular school was likely to be completed at the age of fourteen, that would be the determining factor in arranging the curriculum. If the children were to pass from that school into a school of a different character then they must be taken away at the age of eleven or twelve. There ought to be no difficulty in discovering the capabilities of children at that age for secondary education. He was strongly of opinion that whenever they found children of eleven or twelve years of age who showed ability on the literary, scientific, artistic, or mathematical side, they should at once seize those children not only for their own sakes, but for the benefit of the State, and give them the highest possible education. The only way therefore in which that opportunity could be afforded was by means of scholarships. It should be borne in mind that it was not possible for the parent of every child to afford to continue the child's education up to the age of seventeen years or eighteen years. Therefore the education must be free, but beyond that the parent should be helped with regard to the education of his child, and that could only be done by way of scholarships. He was disposed to think that it was not necessary to select those children in all cases by means of competitive examinations. He thought that the system of competitive examinations applied to children of eleven and twelve years of age was a cruel system, and the teachers themselves should be consulted as to the children who were most competent. After the teachers had been consulted a selection might be made, and those children after having been carefully examined both physically and intellectually ought to be passed on to the secondary schools. As had already been pointed out a large number of children were not sufficiently developed educationally at the age of eleven or twelve, and they might show more promise at the age of fourteen. He was sure they did not want to exclude children of fourteen years of age from the higher education to which they might be entitled. But it was quite certain that the kind of secondary school to which a child of fourteen should be sent ought to be different from the school to which they sent children of eleven and twelve years of age. He was most desirous of seeing secondary education very carefully organised with a view to providing schools of different types. He would be the last person to suggest that anything should be done to lower the standard of our classical education. He thought that was a most valuable training, and young people with literary ability ought to have the opportunity of pursuing their studies in schools providing such instruction. He was equally desirous of seeing schools of the same grade as some of our literary secondary schools, in which the education was almost exclusively scientific and practical, and dealing with modern languages. Such modern schools scarcely existed on the lines which he wished to see. If secondary schools of that kind were organised from which Latin and Greek were excluded, but where the education was carried out upon practical lines, and where there was a sound literary instruction, and at the same time good teaching in modern languages, there would be no difficulty in taking a child who had been well educated at an elementary school and removing him at the age of fourteen into a school of that type. The child could pass from a school of that sort to a secondary school without any break in the continuity of his education. Referring to the question of control, he did not think that the governors of any secondary school would object to some amount of what was called public control. He was not certain that it would always be an advantage. He saw no objection to it; but many hon. Members must be aware of the difficulty which local authorities sometimes had in finding persons willing to accept the position of managers of secondary schools. In many cases the local authority had to appoint persons who were not members of the authority at all. He doubted whether public control would add much to the value of the education given in the secondary schools. He believed public control would be attended with considerable difficulty in the girls' schools to which reference had been made by a previous speaker. The Girls' Public Day School Trust had been to a great extent the pioneers of secondary education for girls, and the public owed them a debt of gratitude. While there would be considerable difficulty in asking that those schools should be placed under local control, he did not see that the governors should have any objection to someone representing the Board of Education being appointed to the governing body. Personally he was not disposed to attach much value to local control in some of our public schools. He was not aware of any secondary school in which the religious difficulty existed. He appealed to hon. Members not to do anything which would raise the religious bogey in the secondary schools. There were difficulties enough in the organisation of those schools without introducing the religious question. In connection with the elementary schools it was a difficulty which existed far more in that House than in the country at large. He was confident that the President of the Board of Education would give a sympathetic reply.

*Mr. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe) said he felt the importance of providing proper facilities for secondary education. If there were any Members in the House who had occasion to complain of the want of those facilities in the past it was those with whom he was associated. He was not aware that there was even one of the Labour Members who had had more than the opportunities afforded by the elementary schools. If they were in earnest in this matter it was because they felt personally the need for adequate provision being made. Something had been said by previous speakers as to the opinion of the working men of the country on this question. There were organised methods of ascertaining the opinions of working men, and a more accurate estimate of their opinions could be obtained in that way than by taking the opinions expressed by individual workmen. Such organisations as trade councils had as good a right to express the opinion of working men on education questions as upon other matters. The principal point raised in the Resolution now before the House was that in relation to finance. Year after year working men through their representatives in trade organisations had passed resolutions in favour of the State coming more to their assistance in regard to secondary education. It was in the direction indicated by the Resolution that working men thought the Government should come to their assistance in that matter. He thought, therefore, that the Labour Members were entitled to support the Resolution. He took it that no Member would oppose the Resolution and say that the child of the workman should not have fair opportunities. The fact that the Resolution had the support not only of working men's representatives, but also of Members in the House generally, should be sufficient to enable the Government to accept it. They had been told that there was not such a demand from the workman that his child should be educated as there ought to be. He admitted that there was not the demand which he would like to see, but surely they were going the wrong way to put that right by stifling the demand. He knew what the feeling was among the people whom he represented when they were told that they had to meet a charge of £3 before a child could be sent to a secondary school. That was not the way to encourage a man who had 25s. or 30s. a week to send his boy or girl to a secondary school and to make the sacrifice involved in keeping the child out of the factory. If the President of the Board of Education could see his way to remove that barrier he was perfectly certain that the working classes would thank him. It was the duty of those interested in the development of secondary education to encourage the working classes to take a broader view of the question than they had at present, so that their children might have greater opportunities for receiving higher education. He thought schoolmasters and schoolmistresses in their own localities could do something to foster the desire for secondary education. When boys and girls were on the point of leaving school the teachers should endeavour to induce them to remain a little longer, and if they could not succeed in that, they should impress on the pupils the desirability of going on with their education at a continuation school. He agreed with the last speaker that examination was hardly a fair test of the qualifications of a child of twelve or thirteen years of age. The schoolmaster ought to be a fair judge whether a young lad had such ability as would make him a fit and proper person to proceed to a secondary school. There was a duty also in regard to the relations between employers and apprentices. At present employers were not inclined to take a lad as an apprentice after fourteen, and therefore those lads who remained at school until sixteen years of age suffered a disadvantage, especially in the engineering shops. Although there might not be much difficulty on the subject of religious tests in secondary schools, there was a good deal of difficulty felt on that subject in regard to the training colleges. In fact, that was the greatest blot on our educational system. When the result of a King's scholarship examination was published, he had known of lads spending as much as 15s. in telegrams to ascertain whether there were vacancies in training colleges for them. And the result was almost invariably that there was no room. In his opinion it was absurd that young lads should have to change their religion in order to get into a training college, which too often was the case.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.) apologised for speaking so comparatively early in the debate, but he thought that what he wanted to say would clear the ground somewhat. The difficulty in which he found himself arose from the fact that criticism had been directed against the Board, partly for what it now did and had the power to alter and partly for what it did and had no power to alter. It was of value to the President of the Board that he should have the advantage of knowing what men with experience in local educational matters felt on this subject. The duty of providing secondary education rested solely on the local education authorities. The Board acted on secondary education in no other way than through the grants, and they depended on the regulations which the Board made. One of the regulations, which, he hoped, would be introduced very shortly, was in these terms—

"A school"—

that was a secondary school—

"may be with or without fees, but any scale of fees must be approved by the Board."

That, he thought, disposed of the criticism directed against the Board of insisting on fees. What was the position as to fees at the present moment? There were, in the 600 secondary schools recognised by the Board and receiving grants, 104,938 scholars, and of these over 56,868 came from public elementary schools. Of these 28,674 attended schools which were already under complete municipal control, 24,941 attended ordinary endowed schools, and 3,253 attended other secondary schools. Of the total 56,868 scholars from public elementary schools, 29,440 paid no fees and enjoyed free education at secondary schools. If they took, in addition, the figures of the children in attendance at higher elementary schools and in the top classes in the elementary schools it would be seen that the position, although nothing like what he would wish to see, was not quite so black as it had been painted. Turning to another point as to how they were going to administer education grants, especially in regard to free places, the duty of providing the schools rested upon the education authority, but it was their business to see that it administered the grants so that the will of Parliament should be carried out. As he construed the will of Parliament he believed he was carrying it out. His hon. friend for the Wells Division had complained with great truth that at the present time there was not anything like a sufficient supply of secondary schools, and it would be a pity if they began to deal with the existing supply by cutting it down. There was a supply of secondary schools at the present time, such as it was, which depended in many cases upon endowments, fees, and grants. Many of them did comply with such conditions as he thought the majority of that House would wish to see, but if they took away the grants they would in many cases be closing those schools. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had placed at his disposal additional money for secondary education, and he proposed to divide the grants for the ensuing year into two categories. The schools which refused to remain under any regulations other than the old regulations he proposed to confine to the old grants, and nothing more. Then he had a second category. He proposed that the additional grants should be given only to the schools which conformed to the new conditions. Those conditions were, first, that there must be a majority of representative managers, either appointed by local representative authorities such as county or borough councils, district or parish councils, or boards of guardians, or elected by popular local constituences, such as parish meetings. The second condition was that the instrument under which the school was governed must not require members of the teaching staff to belong or not to belong to any particular denomination; it must not require a majority of the governing body to belong or not to belong to any religious denomination; and it must not provide for the appointment of a majority of the governing body by any person or persons or any body the majority of whom were required to belong or not not to belong to any particular denomination. Thus in every way freedom of conscience, whether on the staff or in the governing body, was obtained for the school. There might or might not be fees, but if there were the fees must be subject to the approval of the Board, and there must also be an adequate number of free places. Those must not be confused with scholarships. They would be for public elementary school children who would not be asked to compete with children outside, but who would only be asked to pass a qualifying examination. The general rule would be that any school receiving the additional grant should offer at least 25 per cent. of its places for public elementary school children, who should enter free. The schools might have as many more free places as they liked, and where the schools were provided by the local education authority he trusted they would all be free. There were cases, however, where 25 per cent. of the places would not be used in any case in that way. He proposed that, where a resolution was passed by the local education authority supporting the application for recognition by a school which did not in all respects comply with those requirements about public management and conscience clause, the Board might, if they saw fit, waive those requirements. With regard to training colleges, he had found that question a difficult one to deal with. The only conclusion he had been able to come to was that in every training college there ought to be a conscience clause. The training colleges were almost exclusively supported out of public funds. That regulation would, for administrative reasons, not come into force this year, but it would come before the House next year. With regard to the supply of additional schools, that duty rested upon the local education authority, who were bound to carry out the views of the ratepayers. All the Board of Education could do was to offer them the bribe of the general grant; and under the new regulations the Board had materially increased the grant. It would be an increase in the proportion of three to five. They were, therefore, offering a distinct inducement to the local educational authorities to put their hands in their pockets to provide additional schools. He appealed to the hon. Member for Clitheroe to use his influence with the trade councils in this matter. Their resolutions should be addressed to the local authorities, and they should urge upon the local ratepayers the duty of facing the burden. The Government were willing to assist them; but theirs was the primary responsibility, and they must act. The Board's inspectors did their utmost to induce the local authorities to be generous; and he was thankful to say that there were many local authorities doing their utmost in the way of providing secondary schools. It would be invidious to mencion particular cases; but he saw around him several gentlemen who had personally interested themselves in inducing their local authorities to appeal to the ratepayers to find the necessary money, and had succeeded. The Board had to deal with the country as a whole, and their figures were small because many of the local authorities were so backward in taking action. Why, until the law compelled, some of them would not spend the whisky money, much less rate themselves. Very recently a local authority could have got over its difficulty by a rate of a sixth of a penny, but it could not be induced to put even that charge upon the ratepayers. He hoped, therefore, hon. Members would be lenient with the Board of Education and accept his assurance that the Department would do its best with an earnest, active, and intelligent desire to raise the general educational level and obtain a good, efficient system of secondary schools. They would obtain such schools, but meanwhile let a little patience be extended to the Board. The policy of the Board was to democratise the secondary schools in the sense of raising the level and securing for the humblest in the land the opportunity of education for their children in really good schools. Much of the criticism addressed to the Board in the discussion should be directed to local authorities, and so far as the Board of Education had influence the utmost endeavours would be made to carry out the views of hon. Members.

*SIR WILLIAM ANSON (Oxford Univerity) said they had listened with great interest to the right hon. Gentleman's statement of the policy of the Board of Education in relation to the Resolution. The Resolution asked for three things—more encouragement for schools other than elementary, more local control over them, and the diminution or abolition of sectarian requirements. The right hon. Gentleman had told the House in general terms that he had more money to dispose of—which they were glad to hear—which he was going to use to induce local authorities to come forward by offering them more local control under certain conditions; but he had expected from the Board rather more guidance. What had to be filled was the gap between elementary schools and secondary schools of the type properly defined by the Board. Before 1902 elementary schools did good work, not always of an elementary kind; they wandered into the region of secondary or higher education, in some cases doing it very well and in other cases not very well. In almost all cases where they did the work well the attention of the best teachers was distracted from the children who were their proper concern in elementary schools. The Act of 1902 compelled a distinction to be made between elementary and secondary schools. Secondary schools were required to give some teaching in languages and literature and give the pupils some notion of scientific methods, but in almost all cases the practical requirements of the child had to be considered in relation to the work he would have to do, and, though there was an attempt to specialise in the last two years, there was always a gap between the two schools. How did the Board propose to fill that gap, or would it be left to local authorities to work out the complicated matter? When he was at the Board of Education he had endeavoured to move from below and to fill the gap by higher elementary schools developing elementary work on higher lines suited to the requirements of the children. There was, however, still a gap between those schools and the higher type of secondary schools, and he hoped to hear how that was proposed to be filled. Local authorities had taken up the work with great good-will and readiness, and in some cases with a great deal of acumen, but many were inexperienced in the work of education. It must be borne in mind that a school was not made a secondary school simply by calling it a secondary school; and that the education of a boy was not served by sending him to a school which could not give him the education he required. The resources upon which a school rested were Government grants, rates, and fees, and if fees were knocked away the financial stability of the school must be impaired. Now it was proposed that a local authority might start a school and offer it as a free gift to the locality. That would be extremely popular for a time. But would such a school be able to do all it professed to do? The absence of fees often meant lower salaries. If the salaries of teachers were low, the staff would be inefficient, and if the staff were inefficient, whatever the school might profess to do, it could not really do it. Although a school might be ostensibly a secondary school, although it might have a curriculum which excited admiration, although the scholars might be really anxious to obtain teaching therein, although the teachers might be desirous of giving it, yet they might not be able to get the kind of teacher who could give the sort of teaching which the school professed to give; and he, therefore, hoped that the President of the Board would bear this in mind, that if they created a type of school which professed to give a kind of education which it could not in reality give, because it could not afford the kind of teacher who could give the education which the school professed to give, then the splendid conception of bringing secondary education to the door of the working classes would be a disappointment and a fraud. He trusted that the Board of Education would take steps to set free the local authorities as regarded the remission of fees, and that they would also inquire very carefully into the financial conditions of a school before encouraging it, by offering it a grant, to undertake that which it could not successfully perform. They were all glad that the local authorities should be represented in the government of the schools, but the complete control of the school by the local authority was not always to the advantage of the school. In the Report of the Commission on Secondary Education it was contemplated that the local authorities should be represented, but not that they should have the entire control of the schools. On page 56 of the Report of the Board of Education for 1906, an illustration was afforded of a school governed entirely by the local education authority through one or more Committees, and mainly through the agency of the organising secretary. Now, if the head master and head mistress could only communicate with the governing body (the committee of the county council) through the organising secretary, that was not likely to create any strong sense of responsibility, nor was the teacher likely to approach his task with any great enthusiasm. No doubt, with longer experience, local authorities would become perfectly well informed on these subjects, but at present they did not know all that was required for the proper government of the secondary school; and, although he welcomed the representation of the local authorities in all cases, he could not help thinking that the requirement that there should be a majority of local representatives in all cases where a school was to receive the higher grant, was a somewhat dangerous move in the direction of creating a government of secondary schools which might not always be to the advantage of those schools. He was very glad to hear that State aid was not to be altogether withdrawn from the schools which were not under local control. If the Board of Education were to go so far in the direction of requiring local control as to decline to give a grant to any school privately governed, he thought they would do great injury to secondary education. The local authorities had so recently taken up the question of secondary education that the supply of schools was deficient and would remain deficient for some time, if the Board of Education did not encourage reliance on those schools which were not at present under local control. As regarded the training colleges, the effect of what had been told them by the President of the Board of Education was not at first sight very obvious, but at the same time it did not strike him as being very alarming to those colleges which had been built and started by denominations. It would be a very unfortunate thing if in the case of colleges which had been built in the faith that they would be maintained by Government grant, they were to be told that because they were denominational henceforth they were to be starved. The private enterprise which had started the training of teachers in this country had emanated from the Church of England, which was entitled to the consideration due to the pioneer in the great work of training the teachers of the country. He was quite ready to admit the generous nature of the Government grant so far as the maintenance of the students was concerned, but it must be borne in mind that the grant was dependent on the existence of a building. The Government had not until recently offered any contribution to building, and local authorities had shrunk from the charge of maintaining the schools. The requirements of the proposed conscience clause did not seem to him to amount to more than this, that a Nonconformist would be able to go to a Church college, and that a Church of England student would be able to go to a Nonconformist college, both without any fear of proselytising. But there was one matter arising out of the Resolution which he thought its mover ought to bear in mind. It was constantly urged that the Government should bear the whole cost of the training of teachers. If so it was difficult to see where local control came in. He had always urged local authorities to build training colleges and retain that right of local control which could only arise if they contributed something either to the building or to the maintenance of the college, and which was necessary to them if they were to construct a scheme for the boys and girls within their area who would enter the teaching profession. He welcomed the announcement made by the President of the Board of Education that more money would be forthcoming for secondary education. He wished the right hon. Gentleman had told them the amount. He had himself made a humble effort in that direction for which his successor got the credit. The great object which the Board of Education had to carry out was the moulding of the secondary schools to meet the requirements of the children in any given area, and the instruction of the local authorities in the best method of filling up the interval which existed between the elementary and the higher type of secondary school. The Education Board in these matters must guide the local authorities, because they had a survey over the whole area of England and Wales, and they could bring an amount of experience to bear upon the subject that no local authority could offer. It was for the Board rather than the local authorities to instruct and guide the public mind as to what the various types of education other than elementary should be. It would have been more satisfactory if the right hon. Gentleman had said he was going to spend this money for schools of a new and definite type such as were badly wanted in various parts of the country. Before they could form an opinion about what was going to be done for the training colleges they must wait to see the regulations, but he was glad that the action of Board with respect to denominational training colleges did not appear to be harsh.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) congratulated his right hon. friend on the spirit in which he had approached this problem. It marked a new epoch for the President of the Board of Education to get up in the House of Commons and say that the conscience clause was now to apply to training colleges for teachers. He wished to ask one or two questions. The conscience clause was hung up in every public elementary school, and it protected every child in that school who needed its protection, and any child in the neighbourhood might demand to enter that school and could not be kept out of it because of any religious opinions. Would the President of the Board of Education accompany this regulation dealing with the conscience clause by another regulation that no King's scholar who had passed the necessary qualifying examination should be excluded from any training college on account of religion? That was the vital part of the whole question. It was useless to put a statement upon the wall in a training college that any student, once inside, would have the right to abstain from attending religious observances at a certain place of worship. The committee of management of such a college might, under that rule, still be able to exclude from entering the college any student who did not state tacitly, if not expressly, his willingness to observe the religious observances of the college and to worship in a certain place. He rejoiced that the right hon. Gentleman was going to give more money to secondary schools and to insist upon a real course of instruction in those schools. The President of the Board of Education had stated that he intended to invite the governing body in existing secondary schools to admit a number of persons representing the local authority. Did he mean to apply that principle to the training colleges? If so they might expect the management of those colleges to be democratised and then all religious tests, so far as those colleges were concerned, would be removed. More money was to be given to those secondary schools which adopted popular methods of management. Would the President of the Board of Education tell the House in what way he proposed to apportion the grants to which he had referred? Were the grants to be apportioned equally in the first, second, third, and fourth years, or were they to be apportioned on an ascending scale from year to year? The right hon. Gentleman had the advantage of knowing what the figures were up to date. The latest figures which he himself had been able to obtain were two years old. He wished that arrangements could be made for placing more recent figures at the disposal of Members of the House. The statement of the right hon. Gentleman that half of the children attending the secondary schools and receiving grants from the Board of Education had gone through the public elementary schools, and that half of the children were attending the secondary schools free of fees, might be perfectly accurate so far as it went, but he thought it revealed a specious aspect which was perhaps hardly fair to those who had brought this matter forward. How many of the number were probationers or pupil teachers? How many were obtaining secondary education on the understanding that they should become teachers later on? He did not question the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman as to free places, but he would point out that there was not a single secondary school in the county of London where free places existed for children from elementary schools. The Minister for Education had expressed his proud determination to see that secondary schools were really and properly secondary schools, where secondary education of the right type was given. He hoped that that did not mean that in his opinion there was only one right type. No one acquainted with the subject would wish to destroy that secondary education of the classical and literary type which had existed so long. Whether the advantages of that type of school came from the curriculum or the other conditions of public schools might be doubted. He was inclined to think it lay in the playing fields, with their organised games, and the spirit of subordination and unselfishness which they produced. If they could have this in the elementary and the modern secondary school he was inclined to think the same results would be achieved. At the same time he hoped it would be open to local authorities to develop what they sought to develop, and what the people of this country wished—a secondary education of a more modern and more practical type.

MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said he had noticed with especial pleasure from the speech of the President of the Board of Education that he considered the free air of discussion was almost essential for intending teachers who had passed the age of childhood. His feeling was that the training colleges of the future would need to be drawn into closer relations with the Universities. University life, he considered, would provide the free atmosphere which was desired. At the same time he recognised that so long as we provided teachers to give religious instruction some kind of denominational college would be necessary. There was a certain unity of life and thought which could not be got apart from that. He welcomed the suggestion that there should be a conscience clause. To his mind the most important part of the discussion that evening related to popular control over schools which received State grants. There seemed to be some difference of opinion as to what that popular control should be. He himself was in favonr in such cases of some representation being given either to the local authority or to the Board of Education. One of the first conditions of improvement was that the local authorities should realise that the salaries of the teachers should be raised. The whole equipment of secondary schools was something entirely different from what was thought sufficient ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago; and therefore the remark of the President of the Board of Education that because they had got on with a smaller grant in the past, they could get on with a smaller grant in the future was entirely wrong. If this demand for popular control was carried out to its full effect, the result would be undoubtedly that secondary education would be far more costly than at present, because the springs of private enterprise would be dried up, and instead of giving larger access to secondary education for the many, they would be closing many doors and admitting only the few. He held that secondary education should come in future somewhat more under local control. We were still in what he might call an experimental stage, and we could not get any one definite type of what was best. What was needed was diversity and variety which would come through the initiative and capacity of the head masters who were allowed the utmost freedom. The local authorities were new to their work and did not know very much, and, even if they did know their work, however loyal the local authorities and however patriotic their committees might be, they were inclined to make far too rigorous and uniform requirements to suit the type of school which he desired to see. He was perfectly convinced that freedom in the schools, combined, of course, with a certain amount of suitable discipline, was the first of all necessities, not only in regard to the intellectual methods to be pursued, but in regard to the character-forming influences which should be existent in the school. If they asked the best teachers in the secondary schools what their chief grievance in the matter of control was, they would say that they were subject to many harassing restrictions and vexatious regulations which were supposed to be part of a policy of control in regard to grants of public money. Popular control ought, however, in his judgment to carry with it the utmost freedom to the headmaster and the capacity to develop the greatest diversity in the type of school.

MR. STUART (Sunderland) congratulated the mover and seconder of the Resolution on the reply which they had drawn from the President of the Board of Education in regard to the secondary part of the education of the country. There were a good many points in the right hon. Gentleman's statement which might give rise to difference of opinion, such as his references to training colleges and popular control. However, he did not rise to deal with any of those subjects, but to point to two questions in which he thought hon. Members upon both sides of the House would be enabled to approach the consideration of the matter from the same point of view. The first point was that whatever might be done in regard to secondary education the great difficulty which had to be overcome throughout the country was that of bringing the local authority up to scratch in all cases so that they took up the subject in a proper manner. He admitted that there had been a great advance, especially since the Act of 1902, in regard to secondary education, but the local authorities were still behindhand. The local authorities were too distinct one from another and suffered from want of knowledge of what kind of secondary education was to be aimed at, and what class of schools they should establish. There were in the schools two classes of pupils, those who came forward at an early age and were permitted to receive secondary education, and those who were permitted to receive it only at the end of their course of elementary instruction. They could not, however, keep up secondary education merely as a continuance of elementary education. They could not say after a person went through a course of elementary education for a certain number of years that he should go through a course of secondary education. He thought a great deal might be done by the Board of Education in giving much more assistance than they did—although he knew they did a great deal—as to the character of schools required in the country. He agreed with the hon. Member who had last spoken, that there should be greater variety in the schools under the same local authority, and he believed that information on the matter might be diffused more widely by the Department. The other point he wished to call attention to was the unwillingness of the local authorities to raise the money. The real necessity was to raise the demand for secondary education in the constituencies so that the local education authorities would be supported in their efforts to forward it, and he appealed to hon. Members generally to use their influence so that money might be raised for the purposes of secondary education.

MR. SILCOCK said that, after the statement of the Minister for Education, and after the satisfactory discussion which had taken place, he begged leave to withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

---

## LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Order for consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), read.

MR. SPEAKER called the attention of the House to the fact that by inadvertence an irregularity had been committed by the Standing Committee, in that a clause imposing a Stamp Duty had been inserted in the Bill without the sanction of a Resolution of a Committee of the Whole House, agreed to by the House. It was his duty to recommit the Bill.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) submitted as a point of order that probably the best course would be to recommit the Bill in regard to the particular clause which imposed the charge.

MR. SPEAKER said that it was his duty to inform the House that in consequence of the irregularity which had been committed by the Standing Committee the Bill must be recommitted.

Bill recommitted to the former Committee in respect of Clause 11.

Adjourned at eight minutes after
Eleven o'clock.

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

# HOUSE OF LORDS.

*Thursday*, 16*th May*, 1907.

The Lord Brodrick (*V. Midleton*) sat first in Parliament after the death of his father.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders [H.L.].

Also the Certificate that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill: Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) [H.L.].

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]. Petition for additional provision; of the Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Council, under their Common Seal, together with the proposed clause and Amendments annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill; Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill; Boston Spa Gas Bill. Read 2ª, and committed.

North East London Railway Bill; London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill. Read 3ª, and passed.

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill; Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Read 2ª (according to order).

Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill. Read 3ª (according to order), and passed.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907

Published Proceedings and Précis of the Colonial Conference, 30th April to 14th May 1907.

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3788. Siam (Monthons of Saiburi and Puket).

No. 3789. Argentine Republic (Buenos Ayres).

No. 3790. Portugal (Beira).

### EDALJI.

Papers relating to the case of George Edalji.

### MINES (EIGHT HOUR DAY FOR MINERS).

Final Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to inqure into the probable economic effect of a limit of eight hours to the working day of coal miners; Report, minutes of evidence, and appendices.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

### POLLING DISTRICTS.

(County of Durham). Order made by the council of the county of Durham altering certain polling districts in the South-eastern and Houghton-le-Spring Parliamentary Divisions.

(County of Lancaster). Order made by the council of the county of Lancaster re-dividing the Darwen Parliamentary Division into convenient polling districts.

### SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (BOROUGH OF ACCRINGTON).

Orders made by the council of the borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the borough.

### NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Account of deposits in Naval Savings Banks and the payments thereof, and of interest theron, of all investments under the Naval Savings Banks Act, 1866, and the application of the interest or dividends accruing in respect thereof, and of the proceeds of any sale of any stocks, annuities, or securities during the financial year 1905–1906.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

---

## COMPANIES BILL [H.L.]

Bill read 3ª (according to order).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): My Lords, there are some Amendments which I have to propose at this stage. The first one is an Amendment which was on the Paper for the Report stage, but through some oversight was omitted. It does not affect the substance of the Bill, but merely provides that the reissue of a debenture or the issue of another debenture in its place under the section shall be treated as the issue of a new debenture for the purposes of stamp duty, but shall not be so treated for the purpose of any provision limiting the amount or number of debentures to be issued. It is one of those provisions required by the Treasury in order to prevent the evasion of stamp duty on the issue of debentures.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 12, line 34, after Subsection (3), to insert as a new subsection—(4) The re-issue of a debenture or the issue of another debenture in its place under this section whether made before or after the passing of this Act, shall be treated as the issue of a new debenture for the purposes of stamp duty, but it shall not be so treated for the purpose of any provision limiting the amount or number of debentures to be issued.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The other Amendments standing on the Paper are not in themselves of any importance, but are miscellaneous Amendments of the Companies Acts inserted in the schedule. Our object is contemporaneously with this Bill to amend and consolidate the company law. Our scheme is to introduce a Consolidation Bill, pure and simple, and, as soon as this Bill is passed, and the other Bill brought in, then to include in the other Bill all the provisions of this Bill, which we shall repeal as soon as it is passed. That is the best way of separating what is new from what is merely consolidation. Originally it was intended that in the Consolidation Bill there should be certain minor Amendments proposed, but I objected on the ground that such a Bill ought to be a Consolidation Bill pure and simple. Therefore the changes, in themselves unimportant, which would otherwise have been inserted in the Consolidation Bill are now proposed in the form of a new schedule to this Bill. It is proposed to insert, after Clause 49, as a new clause—

> "The Amendments specified in the Third Schedule of this Act, which relate to minor details, shall be made in the Companies Acts."

That would appear at first sight an unscientific way of dealing with the matter, and some criticism has been made upon the form of words, as though it were an unusual form; but our only sin in this respect is the sin of plagiarism, for this wording appeared in the Land Registry Act. I think it is a convenient way of doing what will be admitted on all hands to be desirable.

Amendment moved—

> "After Clause 49 to insert as a new clause: 'The Amendments specified in the Third Schedule to this Act, which relate to minor details, shall be made in the Companies Act.'"—(*The Lord Chancellor*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

> "Clause 50, page 22, line 25, to leave out the word 'Third' and to insert the word 'Fourth.'—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: The object of the first Amendment in Section 28 of the Companies Act, 1862, is to require a company to give notice to the Registrar of the reconversion of stock into shares in the same way as it now has to give notice of the conversion of stock into shares. The object of the second Amendment is to enable a person to require a copy of part only of the register, and to permit some charge being made for supplying the copy. The third Amendment is for the purpose of imposing a penalty on liquidators who fail to file a return showing the date of the final winding up. The fourth Amendment has reference to a reduction of capital and the liability of shareholders in connection therewith. The next Amendment is to allow an increase of the nominal amount of shares when unregistered companies are registered as limited companies; and the last Amendment is to repeal Section 7 of the Act of 1879, which has been in effect superseded, but which has not been formally repealed. The whole of these Amendments are Amendments of details in the Companies Acts which ought to be made preparatory to consolidation.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 25, at end, to insert as a new schedule—

### THIRD SCHEDULE.

MISCELLANEOUS AMENDMENTS OF COMPANIES ACTS.

| Enactment to be amended. | Nature of Amendment. |
|---|---|
| Companies Act, 1862 (25 & 26 Vict. c. 89), s. 28. | After the word "stock" there shall be inserted the words "or re-converted stock into shares."<br>After the word "conversion" there shall be inserted the words "or re-conversion."<br>After the word "converted" there shall be inserted the words "or the stock re-converted." |
| s. 32 - - - | After the words "herein-before mentioned" there shall be inserted the words "or any part thereof."<br>After the word "sixpence" there shall be inserted the words "or such less sum as the company may prescribe."<br>After the words "hundred words" there shall be inserted the words "or fractional part thereof." |
| s. 143 - - - | At the beginning there shall be inserted the words "Within one week after such meeting."<br>After the words "the same was held" there shall be inserted the words "The registrar on receiving such return shall forthwith register it." |
| Companies Act, 1867 (30 & 31 Vict. c. 131), s. 16. | After the word "paid" there shall be inserted the words "or (as the case may be) the reduced amount, if any, which is to be deemed to have been paid." |
| Companies Act, 1879 (42 & 43 Vict. c. 76), s. 5. | For the words "in cases where no such increase of nominal capital may be resolved upon" there shall be substituted the words "either in conjunction with or without any such increase of nominal capital." |
| s. 7 - - - | The whole section except the proviso to sub-section (5) to be repealed. |

—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Bill passed and sent to the Commons.

---

### THE UNION JACK CLUB.

**Lord ROSMEAD**: My Lords, I beg to ask His Majesty's Government if it is a fact that an arrangement is being made by the India Office by which an officer on leave from a regiment in the Indian Army is about to be seconded in order to take up an appointment as "Controller" of the Union Jack Club.

**Earl BEAUCHAMP**: My Lords, the noble Lord is perfectly accurate in saying that a request has been received from the council of the Union Jack Club for the loan of an officer on leave from a regiment in the Indian Army; but the Secretary of State for India, having given the matter full consideration, does not regard the object in view as one for which a charge should be put on the revenue of India or exceptional arrangements sanctioned.

### PROHIBITION OF MEDICAL PRACTICE BY COMPANIES BILL [H.L.].

### DENTAL COMPANIES (RESTRICTIONS OF PRACTICE) BILL [H.L.].

The Lords following were named of the Select Committee:—V. Falkland, V. Knutsford, L. Hylton, L. Ludlow, L. Colebrook.

The Committee appoint their own Chairman.

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Five o'clock, to Tuesday, the 28th instant, half-past Ten o'clock.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Thursday*, 16*th May*, 1907.

The House met at a Quarter before Three of the Clock.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill. Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

Collooney, Ballina, and Belmullet Railways and Piers Bill (King's consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords.] To be read a third time upon Thursday next.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill, "to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Norwich, and the counties of London and Middlesex," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 205.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill, "to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Crediton, Portsmouth, and the Waltham Joint Hospital District," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 206.]

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill, "to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under The Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Minehead and Dunster, Rhymney Valley (Gelligaer, Mynyddislwyn, and Bedwellty), and St. Albans and District," presented by Mr. Lloyd-George; supported by Mr. Kearley; read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 207.]

Armagh Urban District Council Bill. Reported from the Police and Sanitary Committee, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

### MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Marriages Provisional Order Bill; Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill; North East London Railway Bill; London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill; Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railway (Abandonment) Bill, without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled "An Act to repeal Section 57 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and part of Section 7 of The Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, relating to the employment of women and children." [Employment of Women Bill [Lords].]

Also, a Bill intituled, "An Act for amending the Law relating to the administration of oaths for the purpose of proceedings in Prize Courts." [Prize Courts Bill [Lords].]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Companies Acts, 1862 to 1900." [Companies Bill [Lords].]

## *PETITIONS.*

### ADVERTISEMENTS' REGULATION BILL.

Petition from St. Marylebone, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions, for adulteration; from Arbroath; and Forfar; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against; from Ardwick; Kennington Park; Pimlico; Winchester; and Worthing; to lie upon the Table.

### MUNICIPAL MILK DEPOTS BILL.

Petition from St. Marylebone, against; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petitions for legislation; from Long Ashton; and Plymouth; to lie upon the Table.

### POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Leith, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### SALE OF WHISKY BILL.

Petition from St. Marylebone, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### TRUST INVESTMENT BILL.

Petition of the Law Society of the United Kingdom, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

---

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### CASE OF GEORGE EDALJI.

Copy presented, of Papers relating to the case of George Edalji [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### MINES (EIGHT HOUR DAY FOR MINERS).

Copy presented, of Final Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to enquire into the probable economic effect of a limit of Eight Hours to the working day of Coal Miners, together with Report, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### INSPECTORS OF MINES.

Return Presented, relative thereto [Address 27th March; *Mr. Summerbell*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 157.]

### POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF LANCASTER).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Lancaster, redividing the Darwen Parliamentary Division into convenient Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF DURHAM).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the County of Durham, altering certain Polling Districts in the South-Eastern and Houghton-le-Spring Parliamentary Divisions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.

Copy presented, of Published Proceedings and Précis of the Colonial Conference, 30th April to 14th May, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Account presented, of Deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payments thereof, and the interest thereon, &c., during the financial year 1905–6 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 158.]

### GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS SECURITIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 10th April; *Mr. Runciman*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 159.]

### BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Tithe Acts, Copyhold Act, 1894, Inclosure Acts, and other Acts for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3791 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### RENTS AND ROYALTIES ARISING FROM MINES UNDER THE SEA.

Return ordered, "showing (1) the companies or persons in the county of Cumberland holding leases from the Crown to mine under the sea; (2) the dates of such leases being made; (3) the rate of Rent or Royalty paid under each lease; and (4) the amount annually accruing to the Crown under each lease."—(*Mr. George Roberts.*)

### STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Return ordered, "of all sums payable out of the Exchequer of the United Kingdom in the year 1906–7 in respect of Steamship Subsidies, showing (a) the total amount of the Subsidies; (b) the payments out of the Exchequer; and (c) the dates at which the contracts providing for the Subsidies begin and end, the services stipulated to be performed, and the revenue, if any, collected in connection with these services and either paid into the Exchequer or treated as an Appropriation - in - Aid."—(*Mr. Harold Cox.*)

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

### Suggested Remission of Sentence on Stoker Moody.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether having regard to the fact that the incident of the disturbances at the Naval Barracks at Portsmouth, which resulted in the trial by court-martial, conviction, and sentence to lengthened terms of imprisonment of Stoker Moody and his comrades, has left no permanently injurious effects, the Admiralty will consider the advisability of remitting or curtailing the remaining period of the punishment of these men.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Board of Admiralty will in due course consider the advisability of the proceeding suggested by my hon. friend.

### English Government Departments Exercising Powers in Ireland.

MR. GEORGE CLARK (Belfast, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant a Return giving the names of Government Departments or authorities in England which may now exercise powers in or in relation to Ireland, and also a list of such powers.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) If the hon. Member should see fit to move for a Return giving the names of the Departments referred to I will offer no objection to its being granted. I could not, however, undertake to give a list of the various powers which have been conferred on these Departments by numerous Acts of Parliament.

### Distribution of Untenanted Land on the Mount Shannon Estate.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now give the particulars of the scheme for the distribution of the untenanted lands on the Mount Shannon Estate, in the county of Limerick, the names of the evicted tenants who are getting some of these lands, the area, and the annuities they will have to pay, and the number of labourers to whom allotments have been given and the extent of same, and any other particulars pertaining to the scheme.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are not at present in a position to furnish the information asked for in the Question, nor do they consider that any useful purpose commensurate with the labour involved would be served by publishing such details. Full information of such re-sales to tenants will be given in the monthly Returns of advances made under the Act of 1903, which are periodically presented to Parliament.

### Repatriation of Chinese Coolies.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many Chinese coolies in the Transvaal have at their own request been repatriated at the public expense down to 1st May, 1907; and has Lord Selborne reported that coolies brought in without licences would require compensation amounting to at least £20 each for loss of what they ignorantly regard as profitable and advantageous employment, and that any proposal to repatriate them would probably lead to riot amongst them.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The number is 766. Lord Selborne's opinion will be found in his telegram printed at page 5 of Cd. 3405.

### Allocation of the Transvaal Loan.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will state the objects to which the £35,000,000 loan to the Transvaal, guaranteed by Great Britain, has been applied, showing what amounts have been allocated to each item of expenditure.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The account up to 28th February last is as follows:—

| | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | £ s. d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cost of raising loan | — | — | 407,162 19 0 |
| Head I. Existing liabilities of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony :— | | | |
| (a) Deficit of the Transvaal for 1901-2 | — | 541,509 11 6 | |
| (b) Former debt of South African Republic | — | 2,499,880 0 0 | |
| (c) Compensation to loyalists: | | | |
| Natal | 500,285 15 7 | | |
| Cape Colony | 1,060,565 19 5 | 1,560,851 15 0 | 4,602,241 6 6 |
| Head II. Acquisition of existing railways in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony | — | — | 13,077,619 1 1 |
| Head III. Repatriation and compensation in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony :— | | | |
| (a) Advances by way of loan— | | | |
| Transvaal | 2,212,730 4 7 | | |
| Orange River Colony | 506,625 15 5 | 2,719,356 0 0 | |
| (b) Other charges :— | | | |
| Transvaal | 3,602,020 13 8 | | |
| Orange River Colony | 934,908 16 1 | 4,536,929 9 9 | 7,256,285 9 9 |
| Head IV. New development in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony :— | | | |
| (a) New railways | — | 3,818,308 0 0 | |
| (b) Land settlement :— | | | |
| Transvaal | 1,219,924 10 4 | | |
| Orange River Colony | 1,230,000 0 0 | 2,449,924 10 4 | |
| (c) Other public works : | | | |
| Transvaal | 1,290,717 0 2 | | |
| Orange River Colony | 500,000 0 0 | | |
| Railway Department : Improvement of railways. | 1,542,000 0 0 | 3,332,717 0 2 | 9,600,949 10 6 |
| Balance unissued | — | — | 55,741 13 2 |
| | | | 35,000,000 0 0 |

### Naval Pensions—Case of George Day.

MR. W. BENN (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been directed to the case of George Day, 5,954 B, who from 1887 to 1896, and subsequently from 1897 to 1906, served in the Royal Naval Reserve, being discharged last year as medically unfit; and whether, in view of the fact that Day completed a term of twenty years' practically continuous service, he will say if he is entitled to a pension or gratuity.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Under the regulations continuity of service is a necessary condition for the grant of a pension or gratuity, and, even if Day's service had been continuous, the period counting for pension or gratuity would be sixteen years as compared with the twenty years required.

### Pay and Duties of Admiralty Writing Staff.

MR. E. H. LAMB (Rochester): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, before the scheme of pay and terms of employment of writers was approved, due inquiry was made into the duties performed by the writing staffs in all departments of the naval establishments in which writers are employed and also in all corresponding departments at the Admiralty; and whether he will state on what grounds it is proposed not to continue establishment for the grade corresponding to first-class writer; and if, because of interchangeability of duties with another class, he will say on what grounds it is approved to continue two grades.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. As regards the latter part, it was found that under the former scheme established and hired writers were performing similar work, the latter with less pay and little or no prospect of establishment, which was the cause of much discontent. The new scheme provides for one class only; but, in order to promote efficiency and give encouragement to good men, it was found necessary for administrative purposes to divide the class into two grades.

MR. E. H. LAMB: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty with reference to revised scheme of pay and terms of employment for writers, whether, in giving their decision regarding question of alteration of title, the Admiralty will take into consideration the fact that the present title is a misnomer and that an alteration, while involving no expense, would cause keen satisfaction to the men concerned; and whether he is aware that however capable a principal writer may be he is unable at present, in many departments, to rise above that grade, and seeing that the best interests of the service require that zeal and efficiency shall be encouraged, and in order to recognise meritorious service, he will arrange that a proportion of the vacancies in the directing staff of store departments of the Admiralty shall be given to deserving principal writers, on the recommendation of the heads of their Departments, observing that the principle of promotion from the lower to the higher positions obtains in the naval and military services.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is that the present title is considered the most suitable, having in view the nature of the duties to be performed. As regards the latter part of the Question, principal writers have, in exceptional cases, been selected to fill higher appointments; but it is not possible to lay down any general rule for the future.

### Relations in Postal Service

MR. DUNCAN SCHWANN (Cheshire, Hyde): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state the date upon which the regulations prohibiting the relatives of supervising officials being appointed at the same office were so modified as to exempt females; whether the staff were informed of this alteration; and whether, in view of the possibilities of favouritism, he will state the reason for the action.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The regulations, which were to some extent a matter of practice rather than of formal rule, were modified in 1903. No general notice was issued to the staff, but officers likely to be affected are duly warned upon appointment. The possibilities of favouritism are borne in mind, and exceptional cases are dealt with on their merits. It is obviously more difficult for a young woman than for a young man to live away from home.

### Postage on Post cards from Cyprus to United Kingdom.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the charge for postage of post cards from Cyprus to the United Kingdom is one piastre (about 1⅓ pence), while the charge for letters is only one penny and, if so, whether he will take immediate steps to remove this inequality.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Cyprus Post Office is not under my control. I am aware of the anomaly, and have reason to believe that the question of removing it is occupying the attention of the Colonial authorities.

### Seizure of Ammunition at Newcastle.

Mr. THORNE (West Ham, S.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of Joseph Hogarth, who was charged on remand at the Newcastle police court with having been in the unlawful possession of 25,000 Mauser pistol cartridges and 6,500 Mauser rifle cartridges in a workshop occupied by him at 42, Leazes Park Road, Newcastle; and whether, seeing that the magistrates ordered the confiscation of the cartridges without requiring proof that they were dangerous to the public, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The cartridges in question, being kept in an unauthorised place, were liable to forfeiture under Sections 5 and 39 of the Explosives Act, 1875, irrespective of their danger to the public. I do not therefore propose to take any action in the matter.

### Accommodation at Copley School, Halifax.

Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): To ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state the present accommodation of the provided council school at Copley, Halifax, and the average roll and attendance during the last year for which figures are available.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*)—

| | Mixed. | Infants. |
|---|---|---|
| Recognised accommodation | 214 | 170 |
| †Average attendance - | 124 | 61 |
| †Average number on the registers | 139 | 73 |

### Income Tax on Authors' Royalties.

Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether money paid to authors who receive remuneration for their work wholly or in part by way of royalty will be regarded as earned or unearned income for the purpose of abatement of income-tax.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The conditions of payment, which depend in each case on the terms of the particular contract, vary so much, that I do not think it would be possible to lay down any general rule which would be applicable to all cases. Under the Finance Bill, as drafted (Clause 18 (7) (c), earned income is defined, as regards profits assessable under Schedule D, into which category these royalties fall, as any income which "is immediately derived by the individual from the carrying on or exercise by him of his profession, trade, or vocation." Whether, and how far, an author's receipts from royalties should be regarded as being immediately derived from the exercise of his vocation of authorship, or to have become an income from property in the copyright, will have to be determined, as a matter of fact, according to the circumstances of the particular case.

### Irish Council Bill—Powers of the Eight Departments.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the powers of the eight Departments specified in Clause 2, subsection (2) (a), which are to be transferred to the control of the council under the Irish Council Bill; also showing the powers of the authorities specified in the third schedule to the same Bill.

---

† For the year ending 31st December, 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The powers and duties of the Departments and authorities referred to are set forth in various statutes, the interpretation of which rests in the last resort with Courts of Law. I do not think it desirable that I should undertake to lay a Return purporting to give an authoritative statement of these powers and duties.

### Powers of the Irish Privy Council.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is proposed, and, if so, when and how, to confer upon the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Ireland the jurisdiction to issue writs of certiorari, mandamus, and prohibition for the purpose of enabling it to exercise the powers conferred on it by Clause 17 of the Irish Councils Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Judicial Committee referred to in Clause 17 of the Bill is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and not of the Privy Council in Ireland. There is no Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in Ireland, save for the purpose of hearing appeals under Section 10 (3) (d) of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898.

### Irish Council Bill and Irish Boards.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland which of the eight Departments whose powers it is proposed to transfer to the Irish Council, with the exception of the inspector of reformatory schools, is a Department of, or has its offices in, or adjacent to, Dublin Castle; are the Boards or Departments carrying on administrative business in Ireland more or less numerous than the similar Boards or Departments in England; and how many of them are common to both countries.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) There is no proposal to transfer any powers of the eight Departments and authorities named in Clause 2 (2) (a) of the Bill. I am not aware that the local habitation of these Departments is a matter of moment; they are all under the control of the Lord-Lieutenant or the Chief Secretary. I have not found it necessary, for the purposes of the Bill, to inquire how many Boards or Departments there may be in England, nor does the question appear to have any important bearing on the matter.

### New Irish Council—Power of Lord-Lieutenant.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if it is proposed to empower the Lord-Lieutenant to call for a resolution from the new Council; whether, if anxious to revise his decision, he may recall a resolution which has already been before him; and whether he may take independent action to prevent public or private injury in the event of no resolution being submitted to him by the Council.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The eight Departments mentioned in Clause 2 (2) (a) of the Bill will, subject to directions that may be given to them by resolutions of the Council, continue to exercise their administrative functions. The manner in which the resolutions are to be communicated to the Lord-Lieutenant and the Departments will be prescribed by the general rules, Clause 21 (2). As regards the last part of the Question, I would refer the noble Lord to Clause 3 (2) of the Bill.

### Action of Mr. Crozier, J.P., of Blacklion.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that one William Scales, who had sent four calves to graze on the farms of Mr. Taylor, of Blacklion, was called upon by Mr. Crozier, of Blacklion, a justice of the peace, to withdraw his stock and have no further dealings with Taylor; and whether he will consider the advisability of calling the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the conduct of this magistrate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not aware that Mr. Crozier has acted as stated in the first part of the Question, and there is not, therefore, any necessity for adopting the course indicated in the concluding paragraph of the Question.

### Irish Council Representation.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he will say whether the representation allocated to counties in Ireland in the Irish Council Bill is based on population or area.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell*). I beg to refer to my printed Answer to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for South Kilkenny yesterday.†

### New Army Scheme—Financial Liability of County Association.

COLONEL LONG (Worcestershire, Evesham): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether under the new Territorial Forces scheme the county associations will require to raise any funds by voluntary subscription or from the rates, or whether the funds provided by the Government will cover all costs of keeping the new national Territorial Army thoroughly efficient; and whether seeing that the grants from Government are to be paid partly on results, it will be necessary for the county associations to raise working capital to commence with.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The Government grants are intended to provide all that is necessary for efficiency. As regards the last part of the Question, it is probable that advances will be made on imprest, the necessary adjustment being made on the efficiency return being certified and checked.

### Inducement to Militiamen to join Special Contingent.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to offer any, and, if so, what inducement to join the nucleus third battalions or special contingent to recruits or men serving in the present Militia, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question of offering a bonus to Militiamen to induce them to join the special contingent is now under consideration.

### Volunteers—Special Contingent.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether trained Volunteers who enlist in the nucleus third battalion or special contingent will join as recruits; or whether their previous training will be taken into account.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The previous training of Volunteers who enlist into the nucleus third battalions will be taken into account when the amount of training they will have to undergo is determined.

### Trained Volunteers of the new Territorial Army.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether trained Volunteers who have retired will be permitted to join the Territorial Army as trained men in the same way as they are at present permitted to rejoin the Volunteers.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) These persons will be permitted to join the Territorial Force subject to any special condition, such as regards age, etc., which it may be found necessary to impose.

### Barracks without Accommodation for Royal Army Temperance Association.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): To ask the Secretary of State for War, if he will give the names of the barracks in the United Kingdom in which no rooms for the accommodation of the Royal Army Temperance Association are provided.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I am taking steps to ascertain what barracks have not got accommodation for the Royal Army Temperance Association, and will send my honourable friend a copy of the return.

### 40th Brigade Royal Field Artillery—Compensation for Expenses incurred under Orders now cancelled.

MR. HARRIS (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that, after receiving definite orders to proceed on the 23rd May from Gravesend to Glasgow, the 40th Brigade of the Royal Field Artillery have, within a fortnight of that date, had these orders cancelled, he will say whether compensation will be paid to those married officers who, relying on the first order, have taken houses in Glasgow or have incurred other expenses in consequence of these instructions.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 933.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) There is no provision under the regulations for compensation in such cases, which I regret must be regarded as an incidence of the service.

### Labourers' Pay at Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the labourers at Woolwich Arsenal were guaranteed a minimum rate of 23s., and that they are now called upon to lose some part of this wage; and what steps he proposes to take to prevent any encroachment upon the wages of the most poorly paid men in the Royal Arsenal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The fall of wages below the minimum is due to the working of short time voluntarily adopted by workmen at Woolwich in order to reduce the number of discharges. No guarantee, such as is suggested in the Question, has ever been made as regards an irreducible minimum. The Ordnance Factories rules distinctly provide that no concession can be made as regards loss of pay due to the closing of a factory in conformity with local custom or to suit the convenience of the majority of the men.

### Cavalry Barracks for Scotland.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for War what steps he is taking towards the building of cavalry barracks in Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*): I am sorry that I am not yet in a position to make any statement on this subject.

### Extension of Scottish Small Landholders Bill to England.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: To ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to bring in a Bill to extend the provisions of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, as regards fixity of tenure, compulsory hiring, and a revaluation every seven years, to England in the near future.

*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*): I would suggest that the hon. and gallant Member should await the introduction of the English Small Holdings Bill.

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

MR. SCARISBRICK (Dorsetshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the number of torpedoes to be manufactured for the Admiralty during the present financial year; and how many will be made at Woolwich, and how many by Messrs. Whiteheads of Weymouth.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The number of torpedoes to be manufactured during the present financial year is dependent on the torpedo armament of the submarine boats, which has not yet been definitely decided. The proportion of torpedoes given respectively to Woolwich and Messrs. Whitehead will probably be three to one.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): Is that the proportion usually allotted?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I think it is.

### Training Youths at Sea.

MR. BEAUCHAMP (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether 120 youths from "Ganges II." were, early in January, sent to two of the battleships of the Nore Division of the Home Fleet; whether they form part of the complement; and whether he can state the total number of hours spent at sea by these two battleships since the youths were drafted into them.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: 119 youths were drafted to His Majesty's Ships "Magnificent" and "Victorious" in January last; and these ships have since then spent at sea 196 hours and seventy-six and a half hours respectively. Although I deprecate inquiries into minute details regarding the complements of His Majesty's ships, I may say on this occasion that these youths belong to the complement of the ships referred to, being largely in substitution for boys borne in the normal seagoing complement.

### Empire Day.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will give instructions that the British flag be flown on the new War Office building on Empire Day, 24th May.

MR. J. A. PEASE (Essex, Saffron Walden; for Mr. HALDANE): As the hon. and gallant Member was informed last year, the date in question is not one of the days on which a flag is ordered to be flown at the War Office.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked if the Secretary of State would not have it done this year.

MR. J. A. PEASE said his right hon. friend did not propose at present to add to the number of days on which the flag was flown at the War Office.

### War Department Land at Hilsea.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the advertisement in the local papers at Portsmouth relating to the letting by public tender of nearly 400 acres of War Department land at Hilsea in seven lots, in which it is stated that intending applicants may tender for any or all or any combination of the holdings; if it is his intention, as far as possible, to let these lots to separate tenants in preference to letting the whole to one or two persons only, and so carry out the policy of the Government of dividing up Crown lands into small holdings; and whether he will ascertain, by public advertisement, if there is a distinct demand in the neighbourhood for small allotments, and, if so, divide up and let some of the land mentioned in that manner.

MR. J. A. PEASE (for Mr. HALDANE): It is intended to let the seven lots in question separately. It must be pointed out that War Department land differs from Crown lands in respect of the purposes for which it may be required, and it is considered essential that War Deparment land should only be let upon terms which admit of re-occupation without difficulty.

MR. BRAMSDON: Can I have an Answer to the last part of the Question?

MR. J. A. PEASE: The Answer is in the negative. The War Office can only let the lands under conditions admitting of re-occupation without difficulty. There would therefore be no advantage in advertising as suggested.

### Sandhurst Cadets—Delay in Gazetting.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that some months frequently elapse between the departure of a cadet from Sandhurst and his appointment to a regiment; and whether he will consider the advisability of shortening this time as much as possible in the interest of the cadets themselves.

MR. J. A. PEASE (for Mr. HALDANE): Owing to the disbandment of infantry battalions and the necessity for absorbing the supernumerary subalterns, some unavoidable delay recently occurred in gazetting the Sandhurst cadets. As a general rule every effort is made to shorten the time between the departure of the cadet from the Royal Military College and the date of his gazetting.

### Army Pay.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state what pay men will receive on joining the third battalions of infantry under the new scheme; and what reserve pay the same men will receive when passing into the special contingent.

MR. J. A. PEASE (for Mr. HALDANE): It is proposed that the pay of the special contingent when called up for training shall be on the scale of that of the Regular Army, and that their reserve pay shall approximate to the bounties now given to the Militia.

### The Yeomanry.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed by the Army Council that the Yeomanry should still be armed and trained with the bayonet, in view of the fact that, under the new Territorial Army scheme, they are to undertake the duties of cavalry; and whether orders will be issued at once abolishing the bayonet as a weapon for the Yeomanry, in order that the time now spent in training men to the use of this weapon may be better utilised in making them acquainted with weapons more suitable to a cavalry soldier.

MR. J. A. PEASE (for Mr. HALDANE): No decision has been come to on this point.

### New Territorial Force Estimates.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when he proposes to lay upon the Table the revised Estimates and Memoranda about the Territorial Forces.

MR. J. A. PEASE (for Mr. HALDANE): This Paper will be laid on the Table before the date of the Committee stage of the Bill.

### Indian Land Tax.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the instructions contained in the letter of the Supreme Government, No. 397, of 31st May, 1888, sanctioning in the Central Provinces 60 per cent. on all holdings, and 65 per cent. on some, as the proportion of net profit to be assigned as the Government share to land revenue are still in force; and whether, seeing that the land revenue of the Punjab has increased to £1,925,000 in the past year from £1,500,000 in 1891, in which year the Financial Commissioner of the Punjab declared that in many areas quite half the agriculturists were already ruined beyond redemption, he will refer the question as to how far this increase of 30 per cent. in fifteen years is justified to an independent Committee to be appointed by him.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): The rule at present in force in the Central Provinces is that the assessment should not be less than 50 per cent. of the assets, and should not exceed 60 per cent.; but in exceptional cases, if the existing assessment has hitherto exceeded 65 per cent. and been paid without difficulty, it is provided that the assessment shall be fixed at 65 per cent. In settlements made in recent years, the assessment has been less than 50 per cent. of the rental. In his Answer to the hon. Member's Question of the 13th May,† the Secretary of State explained the causes for the increase of land revenue in the Punjab, and he also pointed out that the cases of indebted agriculturists reported by Mr. Thorburn were not attributed by him to the pressure of the land assessment. The Secretary of State sees no sufficient reason for an inquiry such as is proposed.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: Is it a fact that there is also a very heavy tax on the supply of water in the Punjab, which greatly increases the land tax?

*MR. HOBHOUSE: The charge for water in connection with irrigation schemes falls particularly on certain land, but not in connection with the land assessment.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): May I ask whether it is not the case that the scale of assessment which has just been referred to is very much smaller than that which was levied by previous Governments in India, and whether the increase in the land revenue of the Punjab is not small compared with the increase of prosperity resulting from these great irrigation works?

*MR. HOBHOUSE: It has always been held by the native rulers in India that they have the power of assessing the land for taxation in the way we assess it at present. It is also unquestionably a fact that our assessment for land revenue is anything from 15 to 30 per cent. of the assets lower than that of the native rulers who were there before our time.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: Would it not be advisable to have this reply as the result of an independent inquiry? I entirely deny the accuracy of every statement.

### Arrest of a Basuto Chief.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has official information of the arrest in Natal on the 13th instant of Mr. Josiah Gumede, who was one of the deputation of Basuto chiefs who recently laid their petition before the Colonial Office, and returned to South Africa last month at the repeated request of Lord Elgin; and if so, what is the charge against Mr. Gumede; and if he has no information will he inquire by cable.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 577.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): No, Sir. Inquiry has already been made by cable.

### The Imperial Conference.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies a Question of which I have given him private notice, whether he has seen a statement as to the account in a daily paper of an unfortunate incident at the Colonial Conference, of which he said "it is from beginning to end a baseless and impudent fabrication"; whether his attention has been called to the following denial in the same paper to-day: "Immediately after Mr. Churchill's statement had been delivered in the House of Commons, a special correspondent of the *Daily Mail* proceeded to Bristol and saw Sir Robert Bond, who, on being questioned, admitted that the statement published in yesterday's *Daily Mail* was substantially correct"; and what steps the right hon. Gentleman intends to take to remedy what seems to be an unfair slur on two of his colleagues sitting behind him.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have seen the statement referred to, but I have also seen a very much longer detailed statement by Sir Robert Bond, which appears entirely to contradict it, and which also appears in the *Daily Mail.* Sir Robert Bond is out of town to-day, so I have not had an opportunity of asking him which of the opinions attributed to him he holds by; but if I were asked to express an opinion I should say that the statement attributed to him by the *Daily Mail* is another misrepresentation from the same mint.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) asked the Prime Minister, as President of the Imperial Conference, whether it was the fact that Sir Robert Bond's speech at Tuesday's sitting of the Imperial Conference lasted for upwards of an hour, and why the *précis* of that speech was condensed into four lines.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Prime Minister is not President of the Conference. The regulation appointing him President will not come into force till a future Conference. Perhaps I may be allowed to say that Sir Robert Bond handed in a long report of his speech, and it was agreed by the Conference that it should be printed *in extenso* in the verbatim Reports, which will be shortly laid before Parliament.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: The right hon. Gentleman does not appear to have understood the point of the Question—why it is that a speech which lasted for upwards of an hour was condensed into four lines, and why different treatment is meted out to different speakers in the *précis* of the Conference.

MR. CHURCHILL: No different treatment is meted out to different speakers. I do not think it would have been of very great use or value if a long and complex statement, which is shortly to be published *in toto*, had been reduced to the compass of a short summary, especially considering that the question of the Newfoundland fisheries raises matters touching foreign affairs.

MR. PIKE PEASE: When will the verbatim Report be ready?

MR. CHURCHILL: I should think it would be ready when the House meets after the holidays.

### Japanese Bounties in Korea.

SIR F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information showing that the Japanese Government are subsidising cotton goods shipped to Korea; and, if so, can he say to what extent it is being done.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): The reply is in the negative. I may add also that some months ago a complete denial was given by the Japanese authorities concerned to a statement published in the Press that cotton goods exported from Japan to Korea were to receive certain advantages, including special freight terms.

### Truro-Helston Division—Land Tax Commissioners.

MR. HAY MORGAN (Cornwall, Truro): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that, although the Land Tax Commissioners Act, 1906, expressly states that the Treasury shall cause notice to be given to each Commissioner of all meetings of the Commissioners of the county, etc., the clerk to the Land Tax Commissioners in the Truro-Helston Division of Cornwall has failed to notify many of the Commissioners of meetings which have been held since that Act came into operation; and whether he will take such steps as will ensure obedience to the provisions of the Act.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): I am informed that in the West Kerrier Division (in which Helston is situated) the provisions of the Act have been duly carried out. In the West Powder Division, however (which includes the city of Truro), the procedure prescribed by the Act does not appear to have been followed. This is doubtless due to some misapprehension on the part of the clerk to the Commissioners, and I have asked the Board of Inland Revenue to call his attention to the matter.

### Local Government Board—Assistant Clerk's Pension.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that in January last a senior assistant clerk, of uniformly good character, was compelled to resign from his Department in consequence of paralysis of the brain, rendering him incapable for life of following any employment whatever; that, owing to the deduction on account of pension of half his unestablished service rendered as a writer, he has, after thirty-one years continuous clerical service, been awarded a pension amounting to only about 16s. per week; and whether, seeing that under Section 3 of the Superannuation Act of 1887, it was within the power of the Treasury to grant this officer the benefit of the whole of his continuous service which merged into established service, and in view of the fact that this officer's duties in both his unestablished and established capacities were exactly similar, he will take steps to secure a revision of the pension and the calculation thereof on the basis of entire service, as is done in the case of Customs boatmen, established messengers, and certain other classes whose temporary service is followed by established service.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The decision of the Treasury was in accordance with their invariable practice in calculating the pensions of assistant clerks or abstractors, who have previously been temporary copyists, and I regret that, notwithstanding the distressing circumstances of this case, it is not possible to make it an exception. For the reason why in these cases only half the temporary service is reckoned for pension I may refer the hon. Member to the Answers given by my predecessor to similar Questions on 26th March and 17th May, 1906.†

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Is it not possible for the Treasury to grant a compassionate allowance in a case like this?

MR. RUNCIMAN: I fear it is not.

### Camberwell Infirmary.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what was the total cost of the new infirmary and guardians' offices at Camberwell.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The total cost of the infirmary was £183,957, and of the offices £21,799.

MR. REES: Are these not exceedingly high figures?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Without further information I should say that they were generous.

MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): How much does the cost of the infirmary work out per bed?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am seeking details.

MR. REES: Will the right hon. Gentleman extend to the ratepayers of

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 840; clvii, 631.

Camberwell the protection promised to Hammersmith?

MR. JOHN BURNS: I hope we are extending that protection everywhere.

### Local Taxation Grant-in-Aid.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the administrative cost of the Local Government Board in England for the years 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906 respectively; and what amount was paid to it in each year for the relief of local taxation.

MR. JOHN BURNS: Perhaps I may answer this Question. The administrative cost of the Department for the years referred to varied from, in round numbers, £218,000 to £227,000, and the amounts paid to the Board for the relief of local taxation in each of these years was upwards of £8,000,000. I will send the hon. Member a statement giving the particulars for each year.

### Education Grants.

MR. PATRICK WHITE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what amounts of money were paid out of the Consolidated Fund or out of Revenue for the purpose of primary education in England during the years 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, and 1905, respectively.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I will send my hon. friend a statement giving, so far as possible, the information he requires or, if he prefers it, I will circulate it with the Votes.

MR. PATRICK WHITE: Will it be circulated to-morrow?

MR. MCKENNA: I do not think that is possible. I will issue it as soon as I can.

### Medical Inspection of School Children.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if his attention has been called to the evidence given before the Departmental Committee on the Medical Inspection of School Children, showing that the existing methods of inspection, as conducted by the local educational authorities in England, lack uniformity and co-ordination, and are, in many instances, of little value; and whether he proposes to issue, for the guidance of these authorities and their inspectors, a memorandum of suggestions and make a request for annual reports under certain specific headings to test the adequacy of the inspection.

MR. MCKENNA: I think there can be no doubt that when the Administrative Provisions Bill becomes law, some guidance and advice from the Board of Education as to the methods of inspection and the classification of results will be necessary. How to secure the maximum of advantage from a general system of medical inspection consistently with securing the smooth working of the scheme and the co-operation of local authorities is a matter which requires and is receiving careful consideration, but I am not yet in a position to make any statement.

### Education Department Medical Officers.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education in what capacity the two medical men are attached to the Board of Education; and whether he proposes to assign to them definite medical duties, and make them directly responsible to himself and not to the permanent head of the Department.

MR. MCKENNA: The two officers in question hold the post of His Majesty's Inspector of Schools, and it is mainly on their advice that the Board act in dealing with schools for afflicted children and other matters where technical medical knowledge is especially necessary. I see no reason for introducing such an innovation in the organisation of a Government Department as my hon. friend suggests in the last paragraph of his Question.

### Scottish Education Department Reports.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can say when the Annual Reports of the Scottish Education Departments will be published; and will he see that they are circulated two or three days before the Vote comes on.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): My right hon.

friend has asked me to reply. The annual general Report of the Department will be presented to Parliament in the course of the next few days. Most of the subsidiary reports comprised in the Appendix to the Report have already been published, and I have every expectation that all the reports will be circulated in good time for any discussion on the Vote.

### Scottish Local Government Reports.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he can say when the Annual Reports of the Fishery Board, the Local Government Board, the Congested Districts Board, and the Crofters Commission (Scotland) will be published; and will he see that they are circulated some days before the Votes come on.

MR. THOMAS SHAW: The Crofters Commission Report has already been issued. The other reports are in the hands of the printers and the extreme importance of early issue has been pressed upon them. It is hoped they will be in the hands of Members some days before Supply is taken.

### Scottish Slaughter Houses.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been called to the unanimous recommendation of the Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland that private slaughter-houses should be abolished and public abattoirs substituted; and if he will take steps, in view of that recommendation, to carry out the suggestion.

MR. THOMAS SHAW: When the inquiry now in progress is completed the recommendation referred to by my hon. friend will receive careful consideration.

### Inspection of Carcases of Swine.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will see that all carcases of swine slaughtered in Ireland for export to Scotland are inspected in accordance with the recommendation of the Local Government Board, namely, that the presence of tubercular deposit in any degree should involve seizure of the whole carcase and organs; and, if the carcases and organs cannot be inspected by competent inspectors in Ireland, will he take steps to prevent the flesh being sold in Scotland for human food.

MR. SHAW: With regard to the first part of my hon. friend's Question, I must ask him to apply to the Chief Secretary for Ireland. With regard to the second part it is not proposed to alter the system established by the Public Health Act, 1897.

### Diseased Meat in Glasgow Market.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been called to the fact that on the 18th and 20th February last forelegs of chilled beef were seized in Glasgow Meat Market on the stance of the agent of one of the largest meat exporters in the United States; that these forelegs were stamped U.S. inspected and passed; that they showed tubercular nodules and, on incision, glandular invasion; and if he will say what steps the Local Government Board have taken to prevent importation of meat in such condition into Scotland.

MR. SHAW: I have received no official information with regard to the facts mentioned by my hon. friend. The Local Government Board for Scotland have no power to prevent the importation of meat from any country. The present system of inspection authorised by Section 43 of the Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, is, if properly administered, sufficient to protect the consumer of foreign meat, as is shown by the seizure of the meat in the case referred to.

### United Irish League and the Estates Commissioners.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the last monthly meeting of the executive committee of the North Roscommon Branch of the United Irish League, at which representatives from the local branches of Boyle, Crossna, Drumlion, Creeve, Aughrim, Croghan, Ballinameen, Kilgass, Kilmore, Ballybroughter-and-Kilmaryal, Rooskey-and-Tarmonbarry, and Killina were present, the chairman stated that the United Irish League had achieved a great victory quite recently over the Estates Commissioners, who held a certain complement of grazing land around Boyle about which they had sent out notices of their intention to let by auction under the eleven months' system, which intention was successfully frustrated by the Boyle branch of the United Irish League; will he say whether the Boyle Board of Guardians have since appointed three men to act as trustees over the land in question; whether the Government intend to take action in the matter or to allow the United Irish League to have complete control in the county of Roscommon; and whether he is aware that Mr. James Fagan at the same meeting stated that around Elphin all had surrendered their takes, with the exception of one or two, owing to the intimidation practised by the United Irish League.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): The police authorities inform me that the meeting referred to in the Question was held within doors, and they have no information as to the language which may have been used at it. The Estates Commissioners hold seventy acres of untenanted land near Boyle, for the division of which arrangements have not yet been made. Pending the resale of this land the Commissioners advertised the letting of the grazing for the present season, but subsequently, upon the suggestion of their inspector, they let the grazing to a local committee of three, who will arrange to take in cattle of the occupiers of small holdings in the neighbourhood. The names of the local committee were suggested by the district council. The Commissioners were not influenced in the matter by the United Irish League and have no knowledge of the proceedings referred to in the Question.

### Incendiary Fires in King's County.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his Return of incendiary fires affecting Protestant property in King's County within the last six months included property belonging to Mrs. Studholme, of Ballyegan House, Birr, burned 8th October, 1906; Mr. Thomas Taylor, Cumberland Street, Birr, out-offices and hay on farm, 3rd November, 1906; Major Bennett, Grange, Clareen, Birr, March, 1907, and Mr. Cox, Templemore, March, 1907, all Protestants.

MR. CHERRY: My right hon. friend has not furnished any Return on this subject, but he stated, in reply to a Question put by the hon. Member on 17th April, that four cases of incendiary fire in King's County had been reported within the past six months. The only case out of those mentioned in the Question which was included in that number was the case of burning Major Bennett's stables. The burning of Mrs. Studholme's hay shed is believed to have been accidental, and in any case it did not occur within the period. The burning of Mr. Taylor's out-house was clearly accidental. The residence of Sir Hawtrey Cox at Templemore was burnt on 10th March. This case also appears to have been one of accident. Templemore is in Tipperary, and not, as the Question assumes, in King's County.

### Exports of Irish Cattle.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of cattle exported from Ireland to Great Britain during the past year, and the average value per head.

MR. CHERRY: The numbers of cattle exported in 1906 from Ireland to Great Britain, including the Isle of Man, were as follows: Fat cattle, 240,617; stores, 474,230; calves, 55,537; other cattle, 5,897; total, 776,281. The average prices are estimated as follows: Fat cattle, £15 11s. 8d.; stores, £10 15s. 2d.; calves, £4 16s. 0d. The cattle returned as "other cattle" were old cattle, and of very low value.

### Dundrum Bridge Scheme.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the sympathetic attitude of the late Chief Secretary towards the scheme of erecting a bridge connecting Dundrum with Redmond's Point, Ballykinlar, county Down, and the general desire of the farming class in that locality for such means of communication with Dundrum market, he will consult the various Departments concerned, including the War Office, with the object of obtaining plans, specification, and estimates of the cost of the work.

MR. CHERRY: I would refer to the Answer given by Mr. Bryce to the Question put by the hon. and gallant Member on 10th July last.† At that time the Departments concerned, including the War Office, were communicated with, and it was decided, after careful consideration, that there would be no justification for incurring expenditure from State funds upon the project. In the circumstances the Government do not think that any useful purpose would be served by reopening the matter.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Is it not the fact that all classes in this district are unanimous in the desire for this bridge?

MR. CHERRY: That may be so; but it is a matter for the county council rather than for the Government.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: How about the War Office? Will the right hon. Gentleman apply to that Department?

MR. CHERRY: I have given the answer of the War Office, and I do not think it is worth while to worry them again.

### Gort Rural Assessment.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the district council of Gort asked the county council of Galway for a list containing the names of the ratepayers who asked the county council to instruct the reviser of valuations to revise a number of holdings in the Gort rural district in December last; and whether, in view of the refusal of the county council to comply with the request, he will direct the Local Government Board to communicate with the county council, for the purpose of having the council furnish to the ratepayers in the Gort district the information asked for.

MR. CHERRY: The Local Government Board are aware that the Galway County Council have declined to give the information asked for upon the ground that they regard it as confidential. The Board have no powers in the matter and cannot, therefore, require the council to give the information.

### Belfast Dock Labourers' Strike.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the strike of dock labourers at Belfast organised to compel the Belfast Steamship Company to discharge certain of their workmen who decline to join a particular trade union; whether he is aware that, although the local police authorities were formally warned by the company that a breach of the peace was to be feared, adequate steps to maintain the peace were not taken by them and that, in consequence, the York Dock was on fire at 4 p.m. on the 11th May, while the labourers engaged by the company to carry on the work of their vessels were subjected to violence by the strikers, as the result of which some of these labourers have been seriously injured; whether any, and, if so, what, instructions or suggestions had been previously sent to the police with reference to their action on these occasions; and whether he will take immediate steps to ensure such protection to the company's workers at Belfast as shall enable their lawful employment to be carried on in that city without the risk of further personal violence.

MR. CHERRY: This matter is receiving careful attention. The quays of Belfast harbour are policed by the Harbour Commissioners' Police. On the 9th instant, however, before any disturbance occurred, the Belfast Steamship Company asked for assistance from the Royal Irish Constabulary, and a force of about 300 men has since been employed day and night at the scene. Some rubbish and a bale of hay were found to be on fire at the York Dock on the 11th instant. The fire was at once extinguished; the damage was trifling, and no other injury has been committed. When one of the company's vessels carrying imported labourers was going down the river, lumps of coal were thrown by labourers on other vessels. None of the labourers were hit, but one of the crew was slightly injured. The police were unable to prevent this. No instructions or suggestions were given to the police in the matter. The Commissioner is well aware of his duty of preserving the peace. Ample protection has been afforded throughout and will continue to be afforded to the company's workers.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clx., 729.

### Kellet's Estate, Meath.

MR. PATRICK WHITE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners propose to purchase Kellet's estate, situate at Barley Hill, county Meath; and, in the event of their doing so, will they distribute the untenanted land with the occupiers of uneconomic holdings on the estate.

MR. CHERRY: The Estates Commissioners inform me that negotiations for the sale of this estate are at present pending before them. The Commissioners propose to make an offer for the estate provided that the owner should place at their disposal certain untenanted lands which the Commissioners consider to be required for the purpose of enlarging the uneconomic holdings. The Commissioners are awaiting a reply from the owner as to this. If the Commissioners should acquire the untenanted land they will consider the claims of occupiers of uneconomic holdings on the estate.

### Irish Grazing Farm Disputes.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Monday, 6th May last, a grass farm at Castlefrench, in the tenancy of John Burns, Ballygar, county Galway, was cleared of cattle by the adjoining tenants, and he was compelled to put them on another farm at Avaghty; and whether he can make any statement on behalf of the Government as to their intentions regarding the action of branches of the United Irish League in the South and West of Ireland against peaceable tenants owning grazing farms.

MR. CHERRY: The facts are as stated in the Question. The Government were taking steps to replace the cattle on the farm and protect them there, and also to prosecute the persons who drove them off. The Government have now been informed that these persons have abandoned their attitude of opposition to the peaceful return of the cattle to the farm and their retention there without molestation. But, if necessary, full protection will be given to the owner of the cattle.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: May I ask whether the Government will take steps in the future to prevent such a large number of these outrages occurring?

MR. CHERRY: All possible steps are being taken to prevent these outrages. Extra police are being brought into the counties and ample protection is being given.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: May I take it that, in the opinion of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, the South and West of Ireland are in a satisfactory condition?

MR. CHERRY: I think they are. There are disturbances of some kind everywhere; in Belfast at present there are far more.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: The Belfast disturbances are only due to labour disputes.

### Kilmore Demonstration.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the United Irish League organised a demonstration against Mr. Sam Russell of Kilmore, county Roscommon, on Sunday, 5th May last; can he state how many persons took part in the illegal intimidation, how many constabulary were present to preserve order belonging to the local force and to the depot respectively; can he state the expense incurred, and whether any of the participators have been brought to justice; was anyone injured; and has Mr. Russell been forced to give up the farm in question.

MR. CHERRY: My right hon. friend answered a Question on this subject yesterday. A prosecution is pending against eight persons in connection with the matter, and it would therefore be undesirable to enter into details.

### Athenry Demonstration.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that on the 9th May last, seven grass lands on the Lambert Minors estate, county Galway, were cleared of stock, six of the farms adjoining the demesne and one near the town of Athenry, which occupied the perpetrators from 10 to 4 o'clock; and whether the police have taken any action, and if anyone has been brought to justice.

MR. CHERRY: Proceedings have been directed against twelve persons for the offence of unlawful assembly on the occasion in question. The case is *sub judice.*

### Government Land Legislation.

MR. MACLEAN (Bath): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in forthcoming legislative proposals in relation to land, he will insert provisions for relieving the hardships of tenants in urban areas in England and Wales, granting to such tenants powers similar to those included in the Town Tenants (Ireland) Act of last session, and also liberty to enfranchise long leaseholds.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I am afraid I cannot hold out any hope to my hon. friend that the Bills to be introduced this session will contain the provisions he desires, but the matter will not be lost sight of.

### Returning Officers' Fees.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he proposes to introduce legislation during the present session to give effect to the resolution carried, *nemine contradicente*, by this House in March, 1906, for the payment of returning officers' fees out of public funds.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Answer is in the negative.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR asked whether, having regard to the unanimous decision come to by the House, the Prime Minister would not consider the desirability of introducing a Bill on this subject before entering upon rather more controversial measures.

MR. SPEAKER: The noble Lord has just had an Answer in the negative, and he has repeated the same Question.

### Dr. Smartt.

MR. H. PEARSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary for the Colonies whether he has seen the Report in the *East Anglian Daily Times* of 15th May last, of a meeting held at Leiston under the auspices of the Eye Conservative and Unionist Association, which was addressed by the Honourable Dr. Smartt, Commissioner of Public Works for Cape Colony; to inquire as to the propriety of a delegate to the Colonial Conference attending and speaking at a political meeting during his visit to this country, and further to inquire whether the Colonial Secretary can see his way to address a remonstrance to the Cape Government on the serious breach of etiquette——

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. If the hon. Member had submitted that Question to me I should not have permitted it. No Department of the Government in this country has any control over the Ministers of a self-governing Colony.

---

## SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir William Brampton Gurdon reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee B (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No 2) Bill): Sir Howard Vincent.

Report to lie upon the Table.

---

## POST OFFICE SITES BILL.

Mr. Buxton, Mr. George Greenwood, and Mr. John Wilson (Durham) nominated members of the Select Committee on the Post Office Sites Bill.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

---

## COMPANIES BILL [LORDS].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 24th May, and to be printed. [Bill 208.]

---

## SUPPLY [9TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

## CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES 1907-8.

### CLASS I.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding

£348,700, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Rates and Contributions in lieu of Rates, etc., in respect of Government Property, and for Rates on Houses occupied by Representatives of Foreign Powers, and for the Salaries and Expenses of the Rating of Government Property Department, and for a Contribution towards the Expenses of the London Fire Brigade."

*Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) complained that Government property was not adequately assessed. He said that about 1894, when an alteration was made in the system of valuing Government property, the Government would not consent to their property being valued in the same way as other property was done and by the same municipal officers, and the consequences was that although a higher valuation was put on it it was still by no means assessed at its full value, especially in London. He wished to ask why the Government should not consent, like other people, to have their property assessed by the municipal officers in the ordinary way. Unless that was done it would never be assessed at its proper value. The Government, he knew, claimed that they only paid a contribution in lieu of rates as a matter of grace, and that they were therefore entitled to value their property in their own way. But business men would agree that all property, whether Government or private, should be valued in the same way, and he hoped the Government would make that concession. Then there was the question of rates on houses occupied by the representatives of Foreign Powers; the amount was put down at £7,500, of which £3,000 was returned. But why was not all of it returned? Again, why should the occupiers of apartments in Royal Palaces have their rates paid for them?

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury): That item only applies to last year.

*Mr. MORTON was glad to notice that a charge did not appear on this year's Estimates, and hoped that it would not appear again. People who got houses rent free ought at least to keep them in repair and pay rates like other people. He was glad they had that day an opportunity of quietly discussing these matters. The money the Government were spending was his money and the money of the people. The Government were their servants, and it was his (Mr. Morton's) duty to see that they did their work properly. He wanted to ensure that in future the Government would pay rates on their property the same as other people, otherwise it was a great hardship in some districts on the other ratepayers, and to emphasise his point he moved to reduce the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £348,600, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis) rose to support the contention of his hon. friend. He held that the system of rating Government property subjected private property to an unfair competition. Private enterprise was unduly handicapped by the heavy rates, and he hoped they would have some assurance from the Government, either that it would allow its property to be assessed by the local authorities or that it would appoint a Committee to consider the whole question. In his opinion the rating of Woolwich Arsenal and of the various dockyards was absurdly low.

Mr. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) asked on what basis the valuation on which Government contributions were made was arrived at, whether on the ordinary basis of a hypothetical tenant or according to the value of the site and the cost of the building. He suggested that the question was of special interest in view of the large Government buildings which were being erected in the immediate neighbourhood of the House.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) urged that if the valuation of Government buildings were screwed up the taxpayer would have eventually to pay more in relief of the local ratepayer. He failed to see, therefore, where the advantage would come in.

MR. RUNCIMAN said the hours of labour in the Department were quite sufficient to deal with the whole of the coinage requirements of the Empire. The whole of the work was done, and there was no object in keeping those engaged under lock and key after their work was done.

MR. MORTON: Is it eight or six hours?

MR. RUNCIMAN: That depended on the work before them. The hon. Gentleman wanted to know what had become of the £200,000. It had gone into the Exchequer in relief of the taxation which the hon. Gentlemen and others had to pay in the present year.

MR. MORTON: It does not say so.

MR. RUNCIMAN said it was stated. The extra £500 to which his hon. friend had referred was largely due to the new coinage. There had been a very large increase in the demand for silver coinage, and the amount which appeared referred to silver coinage which existed long ago. A very large amount of silver would be added to the currency during the next two years.

*MR. MORTON said he would try to find out where the £200,000 had gone to.

*THE CHAIRMAN said they had nothing to do with the £200,000 on this Vote, and it was out of order to discuss it.

MR. MORTON said he had failed to get a reply from his hon. friend as to the hours of labour, but he would repeat the question on the Report stage.

Vote agreed to.

4. £8,153 to complete the sum for National Debt Office.

SIR F. BANBURY asked why in this Department there has been an increase of salaries by £832. The total of the salaries last year was £15,419, and this year it was £16,251. This was an excellent Department, and if it was necessary there ought to be an increase of salary, but he would like to know the reason of the increase.

MR. RUNCIMAN said the reason was that they had paid larger remuneration to the London broker, because of the great increase of his work caused by recent Acts which had been passed. He had been really underpaid considering the amount of work he did, and it had been thought desirable to augment his remuneration.

SIR F. BANBURY said he was aware of the £500 which had been added to the gentleman's remuneration, and he was very glad it had been increased to £1,500; but that did not quite explain the figure of £832.

MR. RUNCIMAN said the balance of the increased figure was largely due to increments in the ordinary course.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College) inquired whether the increase was due to additions to the staff, or to the fact that the salaries had been increased.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he was dealing with the National Debt Office, and the number of the staff was not exactly the same, being seventy-eight as against sixty-seven. The ordinary increments were fixed by the rules and regulations, which had not been varied.

Vote agreed to.

---

## REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £608,700, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the salaries and expenses of the Customs Department."

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) drew attention to the recent appointment of a naval officer to the position of water-guard inspector at Gravesend. On 27th March he asked in the House the following question:—

> "If a naval officer has been appointed to the position of water-guard inspector at Gravesend; and, if so, whether this is a departure from the past practice of promoting an experienced assistant inspector to such

positions, which was an encouragement to capable men to enter the service and fit themselves for the highest duties of their profession."

The reply he got was in effect that there was no regular custom, and that it was not the rule to make the appointment from the preventive officers themselves. He did not think the answer the hon. Gentleman gave him was very sympathetic, and remembering the last political experience of the hon. Gentleman and his association with Gravesend he was extremely surprised at the answer he gave. He could assure him that his answer had caused the deepest disappointment amongst his many admirers in Gravesend, because they had always looked upon him as a friend of the preventive officer. There had been a great deal of dissatisfaction and discontent among the preventive officers on the Thames for a number of years, and it had been based upon two things—(1) a lack of properly organised promotion, and (2) insufficient salary. There had been inquiry after inquiry, with the result that dissatisfaction still remained. The hon. Gentleman and his department must realise that for efficient service they must have contented workers. Probably the hon. Gentleman would reply that no matter what they gave to a civil servant his mouth would always be open for more. Surely the hon. Gentleman would not say that there was no assistant inspector among the preventive officers capable of filling this position. The preventive officer, as a rule, was an extremely intelligent and efficient man. There was very little encouragement held out to the preventive officer to go on in the profession he had entered, and the pay was small even when the maximum was reached. The only thing that lured him on was the chance of promotion, and if they took away the prospect of being promoted from assistant inspector to full inspector they were robbing the preventive officer of the main thing which induced him to remain contented. They could only make men efficient by good pay and due reward. It was all very well to suggest that these men would get their reward in heaven, and that seemed to be what the predecessors of the hon. Gentleman had suggested. Whilst most of them hoped for that reward they desired some instalment of it now, and preventive officers were no exception to the rule. He hoped the Secretary to the Treasury would be able to explain this matter satisfactorily. Although the appointment of this naval officer might seem a small thing, the whole of the preventive officers had been moved to protest. It was a matter of principle which affected the whole of the service. Surely an assistant inspector could have been found qualified amongst the successful, experienced, and efficient preventive officers to fill the position which had been taken up by Captain Graham. He had been informed that this discouragement of the preventive officers would not tend to the improvement of the revenue. The hon. Gentleman was well aware of the claims of the preventive officers, and if he could defend his position, and make it clear that the Department had done what was right, no one would be more grateful than himself. He begged to move a reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £608,600, be granted for the said Service."—(*Sir Gilbert Parker.*)

MR. RUNCIMAN said it would probably be for the convenience of the Committee if he dealt with this question at once. He had made it his business to go into the whole of the case. For some time past it had been felt necessary that there should be a slight reorganisation of the staff on the Thames, and that there should be some new blood brought in from outside. It was by no means a new departure; it had been done before in the Customs Department, and it was repeatedly done in the other Departments of the State. The heads of many of our great Departments were men who had not been trained in those Departments, and it was all to the benefit of the officers concerned. Hon. Members might rest assured that this appointment would not lead to any extension of the principle. He preferred that such appointments should be restricted to preventive officers; but they could not always find an assistant fit to be promoted. He thought this appointment would have the effect of improving the standard of the preventive officers on the Thames. As to the effect on the revenue, he could imagine no more grave dereliction of duty than that after such a reorganisation they should be practically threatened by these officers with a serious effect on the collection of the revenue. In this case it was felt that someone should be brought in from outside with standing and experience like this naval officer, Captain Graham. They sought for the best man they could obtain. If they could have found an equally good man among the assistant inspectors they would have given him the preference.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked whether the hon. Gentleman could state the nature of the reoganisation he proposed to effect. He did not wish to press for details, but perhaps the hon. Gentleman could state broadly the lines on which the reorganisation was to be effected. They might be prepared to justify the choice of Captain Graham if they understood the circumstances more fully, but the reply which had been given was not satisfactory. He did not think it would give satisfaction to the preventive officers on the Thames or elsewhere:

MR. CLAUDE HAY said that the statement having been made that the preventive staff was to be reorganised, the Committee was entitled to know why reorganisation was necessary.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he did not mean that the staff was going to be reorganised. Sundry changes would be made which would not affect the standing of the officers at present in the service.

MR. CLAUDE HAY said the statement which the hon. Gentleman had just made gave additional point to his remark. The declaration which the hon. Gentleman had made was of very great importance. In this particular service there were a large number of men, and the Committee was entitled to know why none of the inspectors had been held to be good enough for the appointment now enjoyed by Captain Graham. If no reason was to be given why the Government had thought it necessary to get an outsider, beyond the general statement that the present condition of things was unsatisfactory, he would urge his hon. friend to go to a division, so that the rights of the staff might be protected.

MR. WATT asked whether the appointment of Captain Graham was absolutely essential. The Financial Secretary had stated that he would have preferred the appointment of a man in the same service, and that it was only owing to exceptional circumstances that an outsider had been appointed in this instance. Was it not apparent on the face of that statement that no preventive officer was considered good enough for promotion, and that practically the apppointment of Captain Graham was a vote of censure on the preventive officers?

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said he wished to join in the protest against the appointment of Captain Graham. The Financial Secretary had suggested, although the statement was not made in so many words, that this particular branch of the service had been conducted in an unsatisfactory way, and that, therefore, it was necessary to go outside to get somebody to take up this important position. Another ground on which he protested was that in the water guard service the scope for promotion was exceedingly limited. From communications he had received, he thought he was justified in saying that he spoke for the whole of the service when he said that they felt very sore indeed that an outsider should have been brought in to fill this position, thereby depriving them of the ordinary promotion. If an officer in the service had been appointed, each member of the staff would, at all events, have got a step up. The officers in this particular department did not desire to bring their grievances forward in a spirit of antagonism to the Board of Customs, but they thought that at this juncture their position deserved consideration. Besides the grievance in regard to promotion, they complained of the inadequacy of their present salaries. Before a man could be appointed a preventive officer he had generally to spend seventeen years as a preventive man. When appointed a preventive officer, his salary began at £95 a year, and he received annual increments of £5 up to the maximum of £150, so that it took twenty-nine years to reach that modest remuneration, which was less then £3 a week. Those hon. Members who had travelled in other countries would be able to contrast our Customs officers with the same classs of men abroad. One of the first things that struck the foreigner coming into England was the fact that in our Customs officers they had to deal with men who were absolutely incorruptible in the discharge of their duty. That was a thing which the foreigner was little accustomed to in his own country, or, at all events, in other countries which he visited. The bringing in of an outsider to fill an important position discouraged a most respectable body of men who on their merits were entitled to much better treatment. These men thought that a maximum of £200 after thirty years service would be a reasonable thing. They had not come to the House of Commons time after time urging their claims, nor had they communicated with Members representing seaports. They had in a quiet way on various occasions endeavoured to make known their legitimate wants and aspirations. He hoped the Financial Secretary would be able to do something for them.

*MR. MORTON said if the officers in the service had not ability enough to be promoted to such a position as that to which Captain Grahan had been appointed, they should not be in the service at all. Surely these officers, if they were capable, had a right to look for promotion in the Department when opportunities occurred He did not say that there was not good reason in this case for not promoting an officer in the Department, but no information had been placed before the Committee in justification of the course which had been taken. There was a strong feeling among the staff that there had been favouritism, and therefore some very good reason should be given on behalf of the Government why Captain Graham, who could know nothing about the service had been appointed. He hoped a satisfactory explanation would be given.

MR. RUNCIMAN said that the hon. Member said that Captain Graham was an inferior man.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that what he had stated was that the Gentleman was not an inferior man, but that he was unacquainted with the office.

MR. RUNCIMAN said that the Department thought that at the present time it was safer that they should not have a promotion from the ranks of the inspectors, but that they should have new blood introduced for the sake of the efficiency of the whole Department. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that there was not a single Department of the State where that had not taken place. The hon. Gentleman had said that they were destroying all ambition amongst the members of the preventive service. Did any one suggest that the bringing in of a new chief of a Department would destroy all ambition on the part of the assistants? In 1905, the late Government inquired very fully into this matter, and after that inquiry overtime pay was raised to the amount of £11,000 a year. He could assure hon. Gentlemen that the preventive officers had no reason to grumble so far as pay was concerned. Of course, all Government officials thought they were underpaid. A short time ago he received a deputation from the preventive officers and discussed fully with them the matters which they wished to bring before him. It ought to be remembered that a great improvement had been made in the *status* of those servants of the State during the last few years. He thought that the pay that was now given to them was quite equal to that paid to other Government servants of the same rank. As to the appointment of Captain Graham, he admitted that it was an unusual appointment; but here they had a large staff of men who must be subjected to a certain amount of discipline, though not so strict as that in the Army and Navy. He was sure that the Secretary for War would refuse to give any explanation as to the personal qualities of a man whom he had promoted. Captain Graham, he could assure the Committee, had not been appointed out of favouritism. His appointment was nothing in the nature of a job; and the work he had done so far was an absolute success. The object of the Department was to make for greater efficency.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that they had hoped to find a less subterranean reply to the speeches which had been made from the opposite side of the House. [MINISTERIAL Cries of "Oh."] By that expression he meant that he could not understand the hon. Gentleman even when he put his ears to the ground. The hon. Gentleman had spoken of the efficiency of the Customs service and especially of the preventive officers.

MR. RUNCIMAN asked if the hon. Member suggested that an assistant inspector should have been appointed to a position carrying a salary of £650 a year?

SIR GILBERT PARKER said that the hon. Gentleman urged that the Secretary for War made his appointments without question; but he was sure that if certain promotions were made of Naval Officers, a question would be raised in the House of Commons. He was pressing this matter on the ground that he had not received clear and sufficient information on the point he had originally raised. He was not satisfied, and he was convinced that the majority of the Members of the Committee were not satisfied, that there had been a lack of efficiency on the part of the existing staff of the preventive service and that there was any reason why Captain Graham should have been brought in as the head of the Department over the heads of the other inspectors.

MR. MADDISON (Burnley) said that he knew the preventive officers were a worthy set of men. He had always understood that their grievance was that when they were moved from outlying posts to London, where the cost of living was so much greater, they were given no increase of pay. On the other hand he believed that, in regard to old age pensions, there were men doing more skilled work than those men in the preventive service. Allusion had been made to the subterranean reply of the hon. Gentleman, but that was the first time he had heard such a description applied to a reply by a Minister who had made his points clear. The hon. Gentleman had said that he approved of promotion by merit in the Department, and if he had been departing from that principle and assenting to a regular system of men being placed over other men's heads he (Mr. Maddison) would have gone into the division lobby against him. He would not consent to any man being deprived of any hope of promotion by another man being placed over his head, but the hon. Gentleman had made it as clear as it could be made that the Board had carefully inquired into the administration of this Department, and come to the conclusion that it was desirable to introduce fresh blood. It was, therefore, thought advisable to appoint Captain Graham from outside the Department. His chief concern was for the efficiency of the Department; what he wanted was that the State should be served in the best possible manner, so that they got the best possible value from the heads of Departments. The hon. Member for Gravesend wanted the Minister to go into detail.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: I want a clear statement.

MR. MADDISON said a clear statement could never satisfy the hon. Member unless there was considerable detail about it. Supposing there had been insubordination and lack of interest in their work on the part of the officials, was the Minister who took a new departure obliged to justify it in every detail? If a readjustment was necessary it would be made with the minimum of inconvenience to the men displaced, however humble. It was said that the appointment of Captain Graham would be bound to end in a loss of revenue, but he would be surprised to hear that it was true, as an hon. Member had stated, that a man was kept in the service of the State who said he would take it out of the State by not doing his duty. He suggested that the hon. Member for Gravesend should withdraw his Motion for reduction. If there was any idea of interfering with the healthy flow of promotion he would support the Motion for reduction, but as what had been done had been stated by the responsible Minister to be in the interests of the public service he could not support it.

SIR F. BANBURY said that but for the remarks of the previous speaker, he would not have intervened in the debate. The question seemed to be a very simple one. Captain Graham had been appointed because it was desirable to get an efficient person at the head of the Department. He did not know Captain Graham, but he would take it that he was an efficient man; but if there was anything wrong in the Department it would be better if it were stated straight out.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he could not compliment the Financial Secretary on the kind of support which he had received from his own side of the House. He did not think it was justifiable for an hon. Member to impute that they on that side had not the same desire for the efficiency of the service as hon. Members opposite. [MR. MADDISON: I never said anything of the kind.] They believed in forwarding the efficiency of the service by promoting someone who was in that service. Therefore their protest was justified. If there was anything wrong in this particular service in regard to efficiency, why was it not stated? He thought the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote should be prepared to tell them what was wrong and not allow any charge to rest upon individuals.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I made no charge whatever of the kind.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that brought him to the alternative. If there was no charge against anybody why did not the hon. Gentleman get up and state the reason for his action?

MR. RUNCIMAN said he had stated that there was no imputation against the staff, but that there was no man more suitable for the post of inspector than Captain Graham, whom they had appointed. He thought he had laid it down in perfectly clear terms that it was not their desire to bring outside persons.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said the hon. Gentleman's statement was vague. Men in Government positions were entitled to promotion in the natural course, and when that rule was departed from they were entitled to something more than vague generalities from the Minister in charge of the Vote. No doubt, Captain Graham was a very estimable man, but he had had no experience as a preventive officer, and the reason why he was appointed could not be discovered. Was it not the fact that there was a period in connection with this service when it was under serious consideration to abolish the coast-guard service and gather it in in some way with the water-guard service, and this was one of the steps leading up to that? Then finding that they were not on the right tack——

MR. RUNCIMAN: If the hon. Gentleman wishes to save time, I can assist him by telling him that there is not the least truth in his suggestion.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he was obliged for that explanation, because there were rumours to that effect, and the general opinion was that that was the only justification for the appointment. As that justification was now taken away by the hon. Gentleman's explanation, and no other explanation was forthcoming, he should join his hon. friend the Member for Gravesend in the lobby.

MR. LEIF JONES said the hon. Members who were dividing the Committee were not serving the men by the course they were taking. The hon. Member for Gravesend should be satisfied with having raised the question and obtained the hon. Gentleman's explanation. The Financial Secretary had admitted the position that promotion should be from the service, but had said that there were not many who could be promoted to the position to which Captain Graham had been appointed. He would be very unwise to allow himself to be drawn into saying what exactly were the reasons for the appointment of Captain Graham. The hon. Member for Gravesend acted also unwisely in reading the letter from his constituents in which they said the service would suffer from the appointment. That was a thing that every Member would agree they must set their face against. He could imagine nothing more dangerous than that employees of Government Departments should write letters to the House of Commons threatening that if certain appointments were made the public service would suffer. He supported his hon. friend and thanked him for the firmness he had displayed.

*MR. MORTON did not think the speech just made had helped the matter much. Though they did not protect the officers too much they ought to see that they had fair play. No one knew anything particular against Captain Graham, but that that gentleman knew nothing about the service. The question he wished to ask and have a reply to was whether it was the fact that there was no person in the service fit to take up this appointment. If the hon. Gentleman said there was not and that they were obliged to bring in a stranger to fill the office that was another matter. But the hon. Gentleman said just now that the War Office and the Admiralty appointed their officers, and that this House could not discuss the appointment of officers. This House could discuss anybody including the Prime Minister, and it appeared to him that the hon. Gentleman was trying to take away the right of the House to discuss what it paid for. Some hon. Gentlemen thought the House had no right to criticise these gentlemen, but he himself remembered bringing a case before Sir William Harcourt—he hoped the hon. Gentleman would have the courage to take the same action in this case—and Sir William Harcourt made inquiries, and finding the case was properly stated compelled the officials at Gravesend to put matters back in their original position, and according to the Report used some very strong expressions. He wanted to see fair play and hear a good reason given for this appointment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 11; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 169.)

AYES.

Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Capt, James (Down, E.)
Forster, Henry William
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Kimber, Sir Henry
Nield, Herbert
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Turnour, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Gilbert Parker and Mr. Claude Hay.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bethell, Sir J H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Boland, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Cameron, Robert
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Sir Wm J (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
Maddison, Frederick
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Radford, G. H.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Runciman, Walter
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Watt, Henry A.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said he desired to call attention to the case of the out-door staff, whose duties were of a very important character. The conditions of the class whose interests he was advocating contrasted unfavourably with the conditions under which the clerks worked in the same Department. He did not desire to disparage the staff of clerks, but the duties which they performed were generally of a clerical nature. It was the outdoor men who possessed the expert and practical knowledge; it was these men who came into contact with the public, and his case was that their practical, expert and technical knowledge and experience in dealing with the public were not adequately recognised or adequately remunerated. The outdoor staff, compared with the clerks, did not obtain a fair proportion of the higher appointments, especially of the collectorships. The total number of the outdoor staff was 1,700, and of the clerks 500. Between March, 1891, and May, 1906, there were seventy-four appointments to collectorships. Of these seventy-four, eleven went to the 1,700 outdoor men, while sixty-three were given to the 500 clerks indoors. He took March, 1891, as the starting point in making that comparison, and he had a particular purpose in taking that date, because in March, 1891, the Treasury issued a Minute which contained certain promises to the outdoor staff, which promises, he submitted, had not been fulfilled. He relied very strongly on the undertaking given in that Minute. He was aware that successive Financial Secretaries to the Treasury had minimised that undertaking, but the words were tolerably strong. He did not desire to state the case at further length, but no doubt his hon. friends would amplify it, and he hoped the Financial Secretary would give a satisfactory reply.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside) said he recognised fully the force of the consideration that the demands of civil servants for increased salaries and the pressure that was brought to bear on Members of the House constituted a ground for great caution. The matter was becoming a very serious one from year to year, and would have to be dealt with in a more systematic way than had been the case hitherto. He believed that in view of the multiplicity and seriousness of the complaints from various sections of the service from year to year there would have to be a more systematic overhauling in order to see what could be done. He had some diffidence in taking up the particular matter before the Committee in reference to the demand of this section of the Customs Service. He had looked into the matter as carefully as he could, and he felt very strongly with the hon. Member who had just spoken that there was a very unreasonable disproportion between the salaries and prospects of the outdoor section of the Customs Service and those of the indoor section. In the majority of cases, in the outdoor section, the prospect was that of rising from £70 a year to £250 a year, while the prospect of the indoor section was that of rising from £70 to £600 a year. Why should there be such a difference between the remuneration of these two sections? Was it seriously suggested that the duties of the indoor clerks were more onerous than those of the outdoor officials, or that they needed to pay a higher salary in order to secure the efficiency of the clerical staff? It constantly happened that in the case of a consignment of goods the indoor clerk had merely to verify a certain form and check the details, while the outdoor officer had to examine the goods, in regard to the passing of which a very large sum of revenue was dependent. It could not be suggested that the work of the officer who checked a large consignment of cigars, for instance, was one calling for less capacity and experience than the work of the clerk indoors. He would say that it was entirely the other way. Surely it was in regard to the outdoor servant that the possibility of corruption was most likely to arise. He associated himself with what had been said in reference to the general incorruptibility of those employed in the Customs Service. In face of that fact it was surely obvious that that class of men ought not to be worse paid than the clerk employed indoors. He hoped the Government would recognise the ordinary principle of paying an adequate salary in positions of trust and thus guard against the possibility of corruption. He did not think that in this case the salary was adequate, and although he had made every inquiry he had not been able to satisfy himself that the claims of these officers had been reasonably met.

Sir F. BANBURY asked, in view of the way in which the Aliens Act was being administered, whether the immigration officers were doing any useful work. The Aliens Act was more or less a dead letter. It was not right that the money of the State should be spent in providing immigration officers to administer an Act which the colleagues of the hon. Gentleman would not allow to be properly worked. Either these officers should be allowed to do the work for which they were paid, or else they should be withdrawn from the service. He noticed that they had paid £3,000 to Customs officers as rewards for the recovery of goods said to be worth £1,800. He did not think that was a practical way of doing business. He did not approve of the system of rewards. If those officers were not paid sufficient salary they ought to receive an increase, and then the practice of granting rewards would be discontinued.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.) urged that there ought to be a proper inquiry into the grievance of these outdoor officers. All they wanted was that the matter should be fairly investigated by the proper authorities, and there was nothing unreasonable in that demand. At the present time, in comparison with other men in the same branch of the service, the outdoor men were not being treated fairly. He sincerely hoped that the Secretary to the Treasury would be able to give them some assurance that the matter would be looked into in order that the claims of an extremely deserving class of the public service might be fairly considered.

MR. STEWART (Greenock) said he represented a constituency where there was a large number of these preventive men, and he desired to associate himself fully with the statement which had been made by the hon. Member for Bethnal Green and others. No pressure had been brought to bear upon him in the matter, and if it had he would not have yielded to it. He had taken considerable pains to investigate the question, and he was wholly at a loss to understand why the onerous and responsible duties connected with the outdoor department of the Customs had been so lightly estimated as compared with the easy task of the indoor servants in the same Department. The hours which these men had to work were in themselves a sufficient claim for consideration at the hands of the Treasury. The ordinary indoor clerk came to work at a fixed time and retired at the usual time, but that was not so in the case of the preventive men. Vessels came into port at all hours of the night, and the preventive men had to leave their home at any hour and in all weathers in order to board those vessels, and yet their remuneration was lower than the salaries paid to those clerks who had comfortable and easy berths under the shelter of a roof If the matter was investigated he felt sure it would be found that the time had come for a reconsideration. At the present time the men who were responsible for the valuing of goods and the collection of large sums of money on behalf of the Crown were not treated so well as the men who had simply to total up figures and perform the ordinary clerical work of indoor clerks. He trusted that the Financial Secretary to the Treasury would be able to give them some assurance that he was fully considering the matter. If they could have that assurance he was ready to leave the matter in the hands of the Government.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said he noticed that no less than twenty-one of these preventive men were being employed as assistants to immigration officers who were paid by the Customs Department. The immigration officers themselves were in the service of the Home Office. He thought the time was very appropriate now for inquiring into the whole system of the machinery by which the Aliens Act was being carried out. Personally he thought the Government might congratulate themselves that so little inquiry had been made by the House into the question of the working of the Aliens Act. That was no doubt due to the fact that the number of hon. Members who were anxious to see that Act carried out in a broad and popular spirit was very small. He asked the hon. Gentleman what the duties of these twenty-one preventive men were, and what their relation was to the immigration officers employed by the Home Office. He would like to know further whether it would not be desirable in future, as likely to lead to the better working of the Aliens Act, to have all the men employed in the carrying out of the statute under the same office and the same chiefs. He did not believe that any Member of the Committee wished to see a number of men employed whose services were not required. If the Act had been administered in the way it was asserted on that side of the House to have been administered these assistants were absolutely useless. The Report of the Committee on the employment of reserve soldiers and sailors recommended that the

Government, in selecting men to carry out its work, should, whenever possible, engage those men. He was glad to see from a footnote that there were at present 752 pensioners of the Army, Navy, and Royal Irish Constabulary in the Department. He wished to know whether it had been the policy of the Customs Department to engage men who had been in these services, and, if not, whether the hon. Gentleman would consider the advisability of adopting such a policy in future.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said that the claims of the outdoor staff in the lower ranks of the civil service were entitled to consideration. Looking at the question from the point of view of business men, he thought they would be of opinion that the outdoor staff were underpaid and that they suffered from disabilities which ought to be remedied. He supported their claims to consideration on grounds which had not been put before the Committee up to now. He believed that comparisons between the indoor and the outdoor staffs were bound to be fallacious. He supported the claims of the outdoor staff entirely on their own merits. The claims were well founded in themselves, and they did not need to be contrasted with the conditions in any other branch of the service. A suggestion was thrown out two years ago by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when a similar discussion took place, that questions as to pay, increments, maximum, and the general conditions of employment in all these Government Departments should be left to a small Committee of men appointed by the Government of the day—a Committee perfectly independent of approaches from the outside by people who had votes to give—in order that these matters might be taken entirely out of the arena of politics and possible debate in the House. That was an excellent suggestion, and he had hoped that something would have been done before now to prevent the time of the Committee when considering the Estimates being wasted in such discussions. So long as that suggestion was not carried out hon. Members must be excused if they from time to time brought forward the case of any particular body of men. Having regard to the increase in rents, rates, cost of living, and the expenses necessary to keep up a respectable appearance, it was practically impossible for a man with a wife and family to carry out his duties to the State upon a wage of less than £3 a week. He hoped the Financial Secretary would consider the claims of these men.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton) called attention to the case of the assistant clerks in the statistical department of the Customs. He had no desire to make any attack on the Financial Secretary to the Treasury or on the officials of the Customs. His desire was to enlist the personal interest of the hon. Gentleman in this particular class of clerks, and to ascertain whether in his opinion their present *status* was a satisfactory and proper one. He had had an opportunity of consulting with some of these men personally, and they seemed to him to be a deserving and exceptionally intelligent body of young men. Their grievances were two. The first was that they were obliged to work an excessive amount of overtime in order to carry out their duties in the department. His hon. friend had given in answer to a Question some particulars as to the overtime actually worked in that office, and he had distinguished between compulsory and optional overtime. The hon. Gentleman would agree with him that the overtime was very excessive. He understood that for all practical purposes the entire overtime was compulsory. The difficulty in connection with the matter was that the overtime interfered with what the young men desired to do in the way of preparing for superior examinations, and that was a grievance which deserved sympathetic attention. Their other complaint, which he looked upon as more serious, was that having gone into the office on the understanding, and the virtual promise, that after four years service they would be eligible for promotion to the second division, that understanding had not been carried out. His hon. friend had stated in answer to a Question that in no single case had there been any promotion to the second division among these clerks, although the class had been in existence for ten years. According to the Financial Secretary to the Treasury there were in the department 63 clerks eligible for promotion. He submitted that that state of things did not conduce to enthusiastic work on the part of the clerks. If his hon. friend would look into the matter sympathetically he would be very much obliged.

*The CHAIRMAN said that he had been looking into this matter and found that the whole of the expenditure on the Aliens Act under this Vote was returned by the Home Office, and the discussion should take place on that Vote.

Sir F. BANBURY asked whether it would be in order upon this Vote to discuss the administration of the Aliens Act.

*The CHAIRMAN said that the administration of the Aliens Act was under the control of the Home Office and could not be discussed upon this Vote.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said that the men employed in the administration of the Aliens Act were paid by the Home Office. A certain number of men accustomed to Customs work were lent to the Home Office for services in connection with the immigration of aliens The hon. Gentleman must remember that the first estimate of the expenditure in connection with the administration of the Aliens Act was £70,000 per annum, and the authorities were trying to keep the cost well within that sum. A question had been asked as to the employment of reserve soldiers and sailors. They had always made it a habit in the Customs Department to employ as many reserve soldiers and sailors as possible; and at present there were 730 men so employed; but it was impossible to appoint a very large number of men who might be called out for service on the outbreak of war. Moreover, they did not wish to interfere with the ordinary promotion of the Civil servants who had devoted the whole of their time to the service. They had, however, attempted to employ as many reserve soldiers and sailors as they possibly could.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY: How many reserve men have you employed?

Mr. RUNCIMAN said he could not say at the moment. In reference to the rewards to Customs Officers, the smuggled goods consisted mainly of tobacco, some of which was sent to the lunatic asylums, and the rest to Kew Gardens for use in the glass houses. As to the question of outdoor men, he confessed that he found a difficulty in explaining the present situation. A certain amount of blocking had occurred owing to the increase in the number of duties imposed since 1901. An increase of tariff led not only to an increased cost of collection, but to an increase in the number of the staff employed. Therefore, in 1901 there was a temporary boom in the promotion of the clerks, and also a temporary slump in the examining officers' promotion owing to the introduction of a certain number of young clerks. These two changes had done something to make a great difference between the indoor and outdoor staffs. At present the disparity between the two was greater than had been anticipated, but he hoped that by some arrangement they would succeed in reducing that disparity. He could not, however, make any definite announcement of policy. He could assure his hon. friend that he was doing all he could to examine into the case of the statistical clerks. Most of these clerks were young men; and lately they had sent in a memorial to the Treasury which contained this sentence—

> "We have no reason to doubt that your Lordships are aware that you have committed a breach of faith."

He must point out that if any class of public servants were to begin their claim for improved conditions of service by levelling a charge of bad faith on the part of the Treasury whom they memorialised, it was obvious that they prejudiced their case; and he would suggest to his hon. friend that he should convey to those memorialists an intimation that if they wished to have their claim considered sympathetically they should withdraw that charge of bad faith.

Mr. SEAVERNS said that the case as placed before him was, he thought, put with great moderation.

Mr. RUNCIMAN said that the memorial to the Treasury contained a sentence which alleged a breach of faith, and he renewed his suggestion to the hon. Member that he should ask his friends to withdraw such a statement.

Lord BALCARRES said that a suggestion had been made that some Committee or permanent Commission should be set up before which these complicated questions in regard to wages and conditions of employment in the different Departments of State should be impartially considered and decided. That was a subject which ought to receive the attention of the Treasury. The hon. Member for Glasgow had said that no pressure had been brought to bear upon him in regard to the question, but every Member knew that there were lots of people who brought pressure to bear upon them in regard to such matters. Although no pressure might be brought to bear upon hon. Members, a good deal of unconscious pressure was exercised upon the House. He did not represent a constituency which was largely supported by Government expenditure, so that he was absolutely impartial, but if he had 200 or 300 men in his constituency who were receiving Government pay there would be an unconscious pressure upon his mind to get up and urge the Secretary to the Treasury to make concessions to them. They never heard of questions being raised about bluejackets' wages or soldiers' wages. Why? He did not know how many bluejackets there were, but he believed there were something like 120,000, and they were as good servants to the State as anyone else, but they did not hear this kind of question raised on the Vote for their wages. Again the question of the pay of the Army had never been raised except by the Government. There was something unwholesome in the fact that they had to discuss the rates of pay of those portions of the public service who had votes while they were not called upon to deal with the same class of question in regard to soldiers and sailors, who had not got votes. He thought that some effort should be made by the Treasury to take the matter out of the hands of Members of Parliament and to remove from their shoulders the responsibility of saying "No" or "Yes" to the requests with which they were too familiar. He thought the Civil Service would gain rather than lose by having their case considered, not on the floor of the House of Commons, but by a body of men who would understand their position far more clearly than Members of the House of Commons. Members of the House would welcome the removal from their shoulders of that responsibility just as much as they did the removal from their sphere of action by the Postmaster-General of questions of patronage in regard to sub-postmasterships. He hoped that before the session ended the Secretary to the Treasury would give them an assurance that the subject was under the consideration of himself and his colleagues.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY urged the claims of the abstractors in the customs to better conditions of service.

Vote agreed to.

6. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,469,300, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the salaries and expenses of the Inland Revenue Department."

Sir F. BANBURY said there was an extraordinary increase in the cost of publishing and providing copies of poor rates for income-tax purposes. For this purpose £24,000 was put down as against £4,000 last year. He supposed there was some explanation, but if a satisfactory one was not forthcoming he would move to reduce the Vote.

Mr. RUNCIMAN explained that the increase was due to the quinquennial assessment coming in 1907–8.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY said he understood from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that in consequence of the heavy charges and work, he did not propose to take a quinquennial assessment.

Sir F. BANBURY said he understood the hon. Gentleman to say that the quinquennial assessment would be taken in 1908–9, and therefore he did not think it was necessary to take this money now, because if it was not used this year it would have to be surrendered and go into the Exchequer balances, unless the hon. Gentleman followed the policy of the Secretary of State for War, who devoted £100,000 to the new Army scheme. He did not think the explanation of the hon. Gentleman was sufficient, and unless a better one was forthcoming he would move a reduction and divide the Committee, as he did not think it was proper that such a demand should be made.

MR. RUNCIMAN said if they did not need the money they would have to surrender it, but he thought the money would be needed.

SIR F. BANBURY moved the reduction of the Vote by £20,000 so as to grant only the sum which was taken last year.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,449,300, be granted for the said Service."—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

*MR. MORTON thought some explanation should be given in regard to the question raised by the hon. Member for the City of London. But he required a little information with regard to the increase of £8,900 under Head E, Commuted Allowances, etc. How had that increase occurred during the present year? He desired, also, information as to the increase in Superannuation and other charges under Head T, of £13,169. It was very difficult to see how they were to practice economy in the face of such considerable increases.

MR. RUNCIMAN said the explanation of the first Question of the hon. Member was to be found on pages 41 and 42 of the Estimates. The increases under Head T were due to natural causes.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 10; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 170.)

AYES.

Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, RtHn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Hunt, Rowland
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Claude Hay.

NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJH.(Essex,Romf'rd
Boland, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Cameron, Robert
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T.Glen (Renfrew,W
Collins,SirWmJ(S.Pancras,W
Corbett,CH(Sussex,EGrinst'd
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Everett, R. Lacey
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kekewich, Sir George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
Maddison, Frederick
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Newnes, F.(Notts., Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Chas.N.(Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Radford, G. H.
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ward,John(Stoke-upon-Trent
Watt, Henry A.
White, J.D.(Dumbartonshire)
Whitley, JohnHenry(Halifax)
Wilson, P.W. (St.Pancras,S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. CLAUDE HAY said he desired to call attention to what in his opinion was nothing less than a scandal, namely, the inquisitorial proceedings of the Inland Revenue Officers in regard to the Returns made by income-tax payers

*Sir F. Banbury.*

in the form of a statutory declaration. The tax had to be paid months before it was due, and in many cases it was paid year after year through the same office The action of the Inland Revenue Department in this respect was not only offensive, but seemed to impute, if not to assert, that those who made returns by means of statutory declarations were, in fact, liars. Another aspect of the question was that of economy. An immense staff was required to address these demand notes, and it was felt by many income-tax payers who took the utmost pains to make a careful return and who invited the authorities to inspect their books in order to see no error had crept in, that the proceedings on those demand notes were not necessary. He thought it was high time now that the Chancellor of the Exchequer contemplated a new method of collection that he should proceed on the principle, not that most men were liars, but that most income-tax payers made a true return. In order to draw attention to the matter and to ensure that there should be some record he moved to reduce the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,469,200, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Claude Hay.*)

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 7; Noes, 69. (Division List No. 171.)

AYES.

Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Hunt, Rowland
Smith, F.E.(Liverpool, Walton

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Claude Hay and Mr. Watson Rutherford.

NOES

Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Beauchamp, E.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets, SGeo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, SirJ.H.(Essex, Rmf'd)
Boland, John
Brunner, J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Cameron, Robert
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, SirT.Glen(Renfrew, W.)
Collins, SirWmJ(S.Pancras, W
Corbett, CH(Sussex, EGrimst'd
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C(Barrow-in-Furness)
Everett, R. Lacy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hudson, Walter
Idris, T. H. W.
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kekewich, Sir George
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lever, A. Levy(Essex, Harwich
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Maclean, Donald
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
Maddison, Frederick
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Newnes, F.(Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, CharlesN(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Radford, G. H.
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, J.M.(Tyneside)
Runciman, Walter
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Ward, John(Stoke-upon-Trent
Watt, Henry A.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. CLAUDE HAY said it would be in the recollection of the hon. Gentleman that the supervising officers of the Inland Revenue had forwarded a memorial asking for a Parliamentary inquiry into the conditions of their service and their pay. He believed that last year some trifling concession was made to them in matters of service as to which they had made strong but respectful representations. Would the hon. Gentleman entertain the representations which had been made, or would he refuse to re-open the matter?

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that, as he understood, these officers were examining officers who were working an hour a day longer than others in the Department, and while their work was harder their pay was much less. They asked for a Parliamentary inquiry, and, as far as he could make out, they certainly deserved one. They had no Minister to look after them and their interests, and he thought their pay was certainly not sufficient for the hard work they did. As he understood, promotion in other sections of the service was more rapid than it was among examining officers. He thought that these officers had a very strong case, and he hoped the hon. Gentleman would see his way to allowing the inquiry.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he did not know exactly the form of inquiry which the hon. Gentleman referred to.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: A Select Committee.

MR. RUNCIMAN reminded the hon. Gentleman that his predecessor in office had had this matter under his consideration; he had gone into the whole of the claims put before him, and had arrived at a decision. He knew that the hon. Gentleman would be delighted to divide the Committee on the matter, but he would point out that there could not be anything worse for the organisation of the Inland Revenue than to have every year fresh demands for reconsidering decisions. It would lead to nothing more nor less than the absolute disorganisation of the service. The hon. Gentleman must be well aware that his predecessor had gone fully into the case, and if it was suggested that because he had been newly appointed Financial Secretary he would upset the decision of his hon. friend, they were much mistaken. He certainly could not hold out any hope of reopening this case immediately after a decision had been arrived at.

MR. CLAUDE HAY said the grievances of these men had been acknowledged on both sides of the House. He was glad to have it on record that the request to reconsider the matter had met with a blank refusal.

MR. RUNCIMAN said it had met with no blank refusal, and the hon. Member had no right so to represent what he had said. He could not imagine anything more detrimental to the public service than pulling up the system by the roots every twelve months in this way. There was no justification whatever for the statement of the hon. Member that he had met these men with a blank refusal.

MR. HUNT said it was a matter of justice to these men, and there ought to be an inquiry.

Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS VI.

7. £373,400, to complete the sum for Superannuation and Retired Allowances.

8. £368, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £139, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for Hospitals and Infirmaries, and certain Miscellaneous, Charitable, and other Allowances in Ireland, including sundry Grants in Aid."

CAPTAIN CRAIG inquired as to the prospect of another Committee of Inquiry into hospitals already receiving grants-in-aid in Dublin. He did not wish to criticise the grants at present made, but he would like to know, seeing that fifty-two years had elapsed since they were chosen.

Notice taken that forty Members were not present; Committee counted, and forty Members not being present,

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

House counted, and forty Members not being present, the House was adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Seven of the clock.

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Seven o'clock till Thursday, 23rd May.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Thursday, 23rd May, 1907.*

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

### PRIVATE BILLS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]; United Methodist Church Bill [Lords]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

### PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.: — Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

### PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.,—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

Baines' Name Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill; Leeds Corporation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]. Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill; London and North Western Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Newquay and District Water Bill [Lords]; Penrith Urban District Council Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Kendal Corporation Bill [Lords]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [Lords]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords] (by Order). Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited, Order Confirmation Bill. Considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

## *PETITIONS.*

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Blantyre; and, Inverurie; to lie upon the Table.

### ENGINES AND BOILERS (PERSONS IN CHARGE) BILL.

Petition from Halifax, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### PAROCHIAL MEDICAL OFFICERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Dundee, against; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from South Shields, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

## *PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).*

The following Papers, presented by Command of His Majesty during the Whitsuntide Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess, pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896.

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 3792.

### EMIGRATION.

Copy of Memorandum on the History and Functions of the Emigrants' Information Office.

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy of Thirty-fourth Annual Report by the Accountant for Scotland to the Scottish Education Department.

### ALIENS ACT, 1905.

Copy of Return of Alien Passengers brought to the United Kingdom from Ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ending 31st March, 1907, together with the number of Expulsion Orders made during that period requiring Aliens to leave the United Kingdom.

### CONGESTION IN IRELAND (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy of Fourth Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon the operation of the Acts dealing with Congestion in Ireland (Minutes of Evidence, taken in London, 14th to 23rd February, 1907, and Documents relating thereto).

### BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy of List of Public Elementary Schools and Certified Efficient Schools in England (excluding Monmouthshire) on 1st August, 1906.

Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3793 to 3799 [by Command] to lie upon the Table.

### TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series. No. 660 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### TREATY SERIES (No. 13, 1907).

Copy presented of Treaty between the United Kingdom and Peru for the Mutual Surrender of Fugitive Criminals. Signed at Lima, 26th January, 1904. (Ratifications exchanged at Lima, 30th November, 1906) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### WEST INDIAN SUGAR TRADE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st May; *Sir Edward Sassoon*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 160.]

### BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Memorandum by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries upon the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### FEE FUND (HOUSE OF LORDS).

Account presented, of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords from 1st April, 1906, to 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### ARMY.

Copy presented, of Statement showing the proposed Financial Control over the Expenditure connected with the Territorial Force [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### LUNACY (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Forty-ninth Annual Report of the General Board of Commissioners in Lunacy for Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, with Appendix, 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION ACTS, 1881 AND 1892.

Copy presented, of Forty-third Annual Report on Alkali, etc., Works by the Chief Inspector, being for 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 161.]

### PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Medway Conservancy. Copy of Statement of Receipts and Expenditure of the Conservators for the year ending 25th March, 1907 [by Act].

---

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

---

### Stabling for Scots Greys at Tidworth.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state on what date the new stabling for the Scots Greys at Tidworth Barracks will be commenced, and when it will be finished; and also how many horses are now on the strength of the regiment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The number of horses now on the strength of the regiment is 503. A commencement is to be made at Tidworth at once with the stabling for two squadrons, and it is intended that this shall be ready for occupation by the end of the manœuvre season. During the winter I propose to erect stabling for the third squadron, who will, meanwhile, be quartered elsewhere.

### Removal of Scots Greys from Edinburgh.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the decision of the Army Council respecting the removal of the Scots Greys from Edinburgh to Salisbury Plain has been rescinded.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) As I stated on the 14th instant, in reply to a Question put by the right hon. Member for Dublin South, arrangements are in course of being made for moving the regiment to Tidworth, instead of to Bulford. This decision has not been rescinded.

### Canadian Tariff.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the public importance to the trade of this country of the negotiations pending between Canada and certain foreign countries respecting the modification of the Canadian tariff in favour of those countries, he will now give the precise terms of the statement submitted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to the Conference explaining the attitude of the Canadian Government on this question.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) I have to refer the hon. Member to the Report of the Proceedings of the Conference which will be laid before Parliament in a few days time.

### Municipal Milk Depots.

MR. RIDSDALE (Brighton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the cost of installation and of working and the receipts of any municipal milk depots for which figures may be available, and in particular the figures for Liverpool and for St. Helens since the year 1900, and those of Battersea.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The following table shows the particulars which I have obtained on this subject:—

| Name of Borough. 1. | Cost of Installation. 2. | Year ended March (except where otherwise stated). 3. | Receipts. 4. | Expenditure. 5. | Remarks. 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | £ | | £ | £ | |
| Battersea | 659 | 1903 | 736 | 1,124 | The figures for 1907 are estimated. |
| | | 1904 | 1,536 | 2,113 | |
| | | 1905 | 1,204 | 1,779 | |
| | | 1906 | 879 | 1,381 | |
| | | 1907 | 796 | 1,259 | |
| Lambeth | 881 | 1905 | — | 41 | Depot opened in February, 1906. Column 2 shows cost of adapting premises and of fittings and utensils. |
| | | 1906 | 16 | 170 | |
| | | 1907 | 286 | 480 | |
| Woolwich | 663 | 1907 | 189 | 498 | Depot opened in November, 1906. The particulars relate to the half-year ended 18th May, 1907. Column 2 shows cost of adapting premises, of furniture, fittings, and apparatus, and of milk delivery plant. |
| Bradford | 444 | 1904 | 659 | 803 | Column 2 shows cost of machinery, fixtures, and fittings. |
| | | 1905 | 1,383 | 1,453 | |
| | | 1906 | 1,555 | 1,690 | |
| | | 1907 | 1,974 | 1,868 | |
| Burnley | 390 | 1906 | 458 | 733 | Depot opened in 1905. The particulars relate to the two years ended March, 1906 and 1907. |
| | | 1907 | 425 | 640 | |
| Liverpool | (Not distinguished. Expenditure on furniture and fittings, machinery, repairs, and alterations to buildings,&c., is included in Column 5.) | 1901 | 518 | 2,000 | The particulars relate to the years ended 31st December. |
| | | 1902 | 1,535 | 4,335 | |
| | | 1903 | 2,231 | 4,259 | |
| | | 1904 | 1,676 | 3,634 | |
| | | 1905 | 1,644 | 3,632 | |
| | | 1906 | 1,250 | 3,206 | |

| Name of Borough.<br>1. | Cost of Installation.<br>2. | Year ended March (except where otherwise stated).<br>3. | Receipts.<br>4. | Expenditure.<br>5. | Remarks.<br>6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | £ | | £ | £ | |
| St. Helens | 391 | 1900 | 187 | 265 | The figures as to 1900 are for eight months only. |
| | | 1901 | 328 | 471 | |
| | | 1902 | 246 | 403 | |
| | | 1903 | 209 | 440 | |
| | | 1904 | 140 | 326 | |
| | | 1905 | 123 | 300 | |
| | | 1906 | 87 | 272 | |
| | | 1907 | 78 | 256 | |
| Ashton-under-Lyne | 444 | 1902 | 266 | 353 | |
| | | 1903 | 314 | 449 | |
| | | 1904 | 350 | 479 | |
| | | 1905 | 431 | 547 | |
| | | 1906 | 414 | 603 | |
| | | 1907 | 449 | 559 | |
| Dukinfield | 220 | 1901–3 | 124 | 351 | Depot closed after two years. Column 5 shows the cost on the rates. |

### Conveyance of Cattle—"The Iverna."

Mr. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade how many live animals of different kinds on board the "Iverna" on her passage from Drogheda to Liverpool on 11th June, 1906, was she registered to carry, and how many of each kind were killed or injured on the journey.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. Vessels employed in the cattle carrying trade are not registered to carry any particular number of animals. On the voyage in question, the "Iverna" shipped fifty cattle, 4,097 sheep, and five swine, and of these thirteen sheep were lost and three injured. The inspector who superintended the shipment reports that there was no overcrowding, and we are informed by the owners of the vessel that the death of the animals was solely attributable to the excessive heat which prevailed during the voyage.

### Admiralty Committee on Engineer Branch of Royal Navy—Publication of Majority and Minority Reports.

Mr. BONAR LAW (Camberwell, Dulwich): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is the intention of the Admiralty to publish both the majority and minority Reports of the Committee which has recently been inquiring into certain questions concerning the engineer branch of the Royal Navy and the officers of the Royal Marines; and also the remarks of the President of the Committee and the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty on the minority Report, together with the evidence-in-chief upon which the Reports were presumably based.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The Report of the Committee to which the hon. Gentleman refers is under consideration, and the Board are not yet in a position to make any statement as to the action that may be taken upon it.

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Deputy-Lieutenants and the Territorial Forces.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has assured himself that those gentlemen who have been appointed deputy-lieutenants during the present year are willing and competent to assist in organising the Territorial Forces.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): No change has been made as regards the qualifications of gentlemen nominated for these appointments.

### Disbanded Infantry Battalions—Supernumerary Majors.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Blackpool Division of Lancashire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many appointments have been offered to supernumerary majors who have hitherto served in infantry battalions now disbanded.

MR. HALDANE: Up to the present time five of these officers have been offered appointments.

### Cavalry for Scotland.

COLONEL HARRISON-BROADLEY (Yorkshire, E.R., Howdenshire): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Down, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if a regiment of cavalry will be stationed in Scotland after the Scots Greys have been removed to Salisbury Plain.

MR. HALDANE: The allocation of cavalry to the Scottish command is not yet decided.

### Piershill Barracks.

COLONEL HARRISON-BROADLEY: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Down, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War on what date it is expected that Piershill Barracks will be occupied by artillery.

MR. HALDANE: The date has not yet been definitely decided on.

### Bombay Police.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if a special grant was made by the Government of India to enable the Bombay Government to carry out the recommendations of the late Police Commission; if so, will he explain why the recommendations of the Commission have not been carried out in respect of the city of Bombay; if he is aware of the fact that dissatisfaction exists in all ranks of the police in that city on account of the number of their hours and the rate of pay; and if he will take steps to remove reasonable grounds of complaint.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for India if any improvement has been made in the pay and in the conditions of service of the Bombay City Native Police since the recent strike.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): Perhaps the hon. Member will permit me to answer his Questions together. Recurring grants of £33,333 in 1905-06 and £16,666 in 1906-07 were made to the Government of Bombay to assist them in carrying out the reforms decided upon as a result of the recommendations of the Police Commission. How far it has been possible to give effect to those reforms in the case of the City Police I do not know. Nor have I any official information as to the existence of dissatisfaction in that force. I will make inquiries on these points. I gather from the newspapers that the strike recently threatened was not actually carried out.

### West African Shipping Trade.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the West African Colonial Governments or Crown Agents can ship any railway materials to the West Coast by any other vessels than those of the Elder Dempster line; whether if they employ any other shipper they forfeit all the rebates due to them from the Elder Dempster line; what the total rebates so forfeited would amount to if the monopoly were broken now; and whether any calculations have been made to see in how many years the reduced freight obtainable from free competition would repay the loss of these rebates.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): There is nothing to prevent the Crown Agents, as agents for the Governments of the West African Colonies and Protectorates, from shipping railway materials by other vessels than those managed by Messrs. Elder Dempster & Company if more favourable terms could be obtained. The rebates would of course be forfeited, but this would be taken into consideration in comparing rates and it might be worth while to forfeit them. In the three years 1903–5 the rebates for all the West African Governments averaged only £4,500 a year, but of course the amount of the rebate in any year varies according to the quantity of materials shipped. In the absence of the necessary data, it is not possible to make the calculations suggested in the last paragraph of the Question.

MR. WEDGWOOD: Would it not be better, in view of the growing trade to the West Coast, to break these rebates as soon as possible rather than wait till the sacrifice becomes heavier than at present?

MR. CHURCHILL: That is a very difficult question of policy which involves the balancing of very complicated considerations, and I could not give an Answer on the spur of the moment.

### Imperial Conference—All-British Mai Service.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the estimates laid before the Colonial Conference as to the number of days that the proposed All-British subsidised mail service would take in getting to New Zealand or Australia took any account of the time to be spent coaling; if so, where they propose to coal; and, if not, whether any estimate has been formed as to the coal capacity required to drive a mail steamer from Vancouver to Auckland at twenty-one knots.

MR. CHURCHILL: No definite scheme was placed before the Conference, and the points referred to by the hon. Member have not yet been examined, as they will have to be, in severe and minute detail.

### Report of the Imperial Conference.

COLONEL HARRISON-BROADLEY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can now state when the verbatim Report of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference just concluded will be issued; and whether, in view of the importance of many of the subjects under discussion, he will expedite the publication as far as possible and issue separate volumes singly or dealing with groups of subjects.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is hoped that the printed Report of the proceedings will be issued about the end of this month. Much delay would be involved if separate volumes were issued dealing with different subjects.

### Opium for Chinese Coolies in the Transvaal.

COLONEL HARRISON-BROADLEY: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Down, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the terms under which Chinese coolies in the Transvaal can obtain opium have now been revised.

MR. CHURCHILL: The question of the amendment of the Ordinance by the reduction of the maximum amount which can be issued was to be brought to the attention of the new Government by Lord Selborne, but I have not heard what decision has been taken.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Has the right hon. Gentlemen seen a Report by the Commissioner of British Central Africa to the Colonial Office attributing the immunity from fever and the exceptional good health enjoyed by the Sikhs to the moderate and medicinal use of opium?

MR. CHURCHILL: No, Sir, but I will inquire as to that.

### Board of Trade Returns.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks): On behalf of the hon. Member for Darlington, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been drawn to the imperfections of the machinery classification in the annual statements of the trade of the United Kingdom, and the difficulty of comparing the growth of trade in any particular branch of the engineering industries; and whether he will take steps, by the appointment of a Departmental Committee or otherwise, to rearrange the classification of this industry in closer accord with the present organisation of the trade.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): The Board of Trade will take steps to consult representative organisations of manufacturers or traders interested and will also refer the question raised by the hon. Member to the Departmental Committee which meets every autumn for the purpose of considering suggestions affecting the form and scope of the trade accounts to be issued for the ensuing year.

### German Muslin Imports.

COLONEL HARRISON-BROADLEY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that a large part of the exports of muslins to Germany are not genuine exports, but consist of muslins in the grey, sent to Germany to be finished there and subsequently reimported; and whether he has any information showing the magnitude of this finishing trade.

MR. KEARLEY: I am aware that a certain portion of the cotton tissues including muslins, exported from this country to Germany are sent in what is termed in the German official returns the "improvement trade," *i.e.*, for the further manipulation, finishing, etc. Very little of this, however, comes back to the United Kingdom, the whole amount of the German re-exports of ordinary cotton piece goods to this country in 1905 in this "improvement trade" amounting only to about £90,000.

### Secondary Schools.

COLONEL HARRISON-BROADLEY: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Down, I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education when the new regulations dealing with secondary schools will be in the hands of Members.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. McKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): The Regulations in question are receiving careful consideration and are not yet finally drafted. I hope that they may be issued early in June.

### United States and Germany.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks): On behalf of the hon. Member for Darlington, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that among the concessions granted by the United States to Germany are the abandonment by the United States Government of its secret special agents' service so far as Germany is concerned, the continuance of the present policy of affording open hearings when requested by importers or consignees of German goods, and the acceptance of, as evidence, and the careful consideration of certificates of German Chambers of Commerce giving wholesale prices of German manufactures; and whether, in the event of the treaty including these concessions being ratified, the same concessions would be extended to this country by the operation of our most-favoured-nation treaty with the United States.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I do not understand that the special agents' service is to be abandoned, though changes are to be made in the conditions under which their work has hitherto been carried on. The policy of affording open hearings in reappraisement cases will be subject to this procedure being not detrimental to the public interest. Certificates of Chambers of Commerce will not be invariably recognised without other evidence. The concessions in respect of these matters will be for the benefit of all countries.

### British Shipping Claims against Russia.

SIR J. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how many cases are still outstanding with the Russian Government in connection with disputes about ships injured or detained during the Russo-Japanese war.

SIR EDWARD GREY: There are twelve altogether, four of which are pending before the prize court at Libau. In one of the others, His Majesty's Government have proposed arbitration, and the same course will be advocated with regard to the others if they cannot be settled satisfactorily in any other way.

### Banagher Grazing Farm Dispute.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the police at Banagher, county Roscommon, were, until Monday the 13th instant, engaged in trying to recover quantities of cattle which had been scattered from grazing farms on Friday the 10th instant; and, seeing that the local police of Ballintubber were overpowered by a crowd and driven back to barracks, and that several hundreds of cattle were then driven off farms belonging to graziers, will he state what action he proposes to take.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, (Liverpool, Exchange): The right hon. Gentleman has asked me to reply. The facts are not correctly stated in the Question. On Friday, the 10th instant, twenty-three head of cattle belonging to Mr. Payne were driven off a farm near Ballintubber. The cattle were restored to the owner on the same evening. No other cattle were driven off farms in the district on that date. A prosecution has been directed against twelve persons for unlawful assembly in connection with the driving of Mr. Payne's cattle. The case is *sub judice.*

MR. CARLILE: Were the police, as a matter of fact, overpowered?

MR. CHERRY: To this extent: they were few in number, the crowd was a large one, and they thought it prudent not to interfere. They afterwards recovered the cattle.

### Allotments and Small Holdings.

SIR J. RANDLES: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will lay upon the Table a Memorandum of such evidence as is contained in Parliamentary Papers showing that the demand for allotments and small holdings is adequately met by existing supplies.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): No, Sir, as full information on this subject exists in Parliamentary Papers, it is unnecessary for me to add to their number.

### Irish Council Bill.

SIR F. BANBURY asked the Prime Minister when it was proposed to take the Second Reading of the Irish Council Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN: I think the hon. Baronet had better put off that Question till Monday. We have just returned from our holiday and have hardly had time to consider the matter.

## A QUESTION OF PROCEDURE.

MR. FORSTER asked the ruling of Mr. Speaker as to whether, seeing that the proceedings in Committee of Supply on the previous Thursday before the adjournment were terminated by a count-out, it was not necessary that a Motion should be made to-day setting up Supply again, and also what was the proper time for the Chairman of Committee of Ways and Means to report to the House the Resolutions agreed to in Committee of Supply on the day of the Adjournment.

*MR. SPEAKER said that under the old practice, if a count took place whilst the House was in Committee of Supply, it was customary for a Motion to be made on the next occasion for Supply, that the House do immediately resolve itself into Committee of Supply. Under the new system of Supply, which rested upon Standing Order 15, that particular Motion was no longer necessary. That being so, he ruled that Supply was rightly put down as the first order for this day, and that no further Motion was required to set it up. As to the second question, following former precedents, the proper time for the Chairman to make his report was when he reported any Resolutions which might be arrived at to-day.

MR. FORSTER: Will last Thursday count as an allotted day?

*MR. SPEAKER: Yes; the conditions of the Rule were complied with.

## SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill), Mr. Harwood, and had appointed in substitution, Mr. Duckworth (in respect of the Butter and Margarine Bill).

Report to lie upon the Table.

## SUPPLY [10TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

## CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

### CLASS II.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £77,840, be granted to His Majesty to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, and of Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, including certain Grants in Aid."

*MR. COURTHOPE (Rye, Sussex) rose to move a reduction of the Vote by £100 for the purpose of raising the question of the administration of the Hop Act of 1866, and to ask why the Act had not been applied to foreign as well as to British hops. He said that he had discussed the matter to a certain extent with the hon. Baronet representing the Board of Agriculture, and he gathered that a question might be raised as to whether it was a matter of administration or one requiring legislation. He was surprised at the suggestion that legislation was required for the application of the Hop Act of 1866 to foreign hops, because he thought it was quite clear to anyone who had studied the question that the Board of Agriculture not only had power to apply the Act to foreign hops, but had a statutory obligation imposed upon it. He would try and convince the Committee that it was only an administrative matter. It was clear from the Act itself that foreign as well as British hops were included. The first section contained the words "any person, whether a subject of His Majesty or not." He did not think that those words would be there unless it was the intention of the House that all hops wherever grown, no matter by whom, should be included. He did not for a moment contend that Sections 2 and 3 applied to foreign hops, but Section 5, which dealt with mixing, expressly included not only the grower, but "any person who shall sell or expose for sale," and Section 6 imposed penalties "on any person selling or exposing for sale hops which are not marked in the manner prescribed by the former section," and added the words "or place." Those words were quite unnecessary so far as English hops were concerned, and the only *raison d'etre* for them was to bring in foreign hops grown by people outside our jurisdiction, and to impose responsibilities and liabilities on the vendor in this country. The same principle was continued right through the Act. Section 18, for instance, imposed an express obligation on the vendor. Words were there inserted which were redundant so far as British hops were concerned, and were simply inserted for the purpose of including foreign hops. Section 7, and Section 7 alone, differentiated between British and foreign hops. All the other sections used the word "hops" generally, without any qualification. He maintained, therefore, that the Act was clearly intended to apply to all classes of hops. It was abundantly clear, he thought, that the regulations and restrictions imposed by the Act could be applied to foreign hops. He would, however, go further, and endeavour to convince the Committee not only that it could, but that the Act was intended by the House of Commons in 1866 to apply to foreign hops. If anyone studied the preamble of the Act and read the Second Reading debate on the subject, especially the speech of Mr. Huddleston who introduced the Bill, it would be seen that the Act was no new law, but was an Act simply to consolidate and make effective the law already existing. In order to get a clear view of the object and intentions of the Act, they had to look at the law as it existed prior to the Act of 1866. There were on the Statute Book at that time four or five Acts. The first was dated 1710 in the reign of Queen Anne, and three or four others were passed in the reign of George III., imposing regulations as to the marking and mixing of hops. Those regulations were imposed for the sole purpose of the hop duty. That duty was not only an excise duty, but an import duty, and the marking and mixing Acts which had been passed affected foreign hops coming into this country as well as hops which were British grown. The Act of 1866 merely consolidated the previous Acts. In the old days part of the marking was carried out by the Revenue officials, and part by the grower, the latter indicating the place of growth, whilst the former marked the weight. When the hop duties were repealed in 1861, the functions of the Revenue officials to mark the weight naturally ceased, and that gave rise to opportunities for fraud and false marking which were taken advantage of by certain unscrupulous hop-growers and merchants. In order to do away with those abuses the Act of 1866 was brought in and passed by Parliament. He would point out that when the hop duty was repealed in 1861, the Legislature was careful not to repeal the regulations as to marking and mixing so far as the growers and vendors were concerned, and it was those regulations which were consolidated by the Act of 1866. The Acts which were consolidated applied to all hops, whether British or foreign. Not only, therefore, was the Act of 1866 intended to apply to foreign hops, but it actually did so apply. He was quite conscious that it might be said, "Oh, that is all very well, but it never has been applied. Surely the mere fact that it never has been applied is strong evidence that it could not be applied?" He thought, however, that there was a good answer to that suggestion. The Act was passed in 1866, and that was a time of great prosperity for the British grower. From 1859 to 1878, with the exception of one year, there was a steady and material increase in the prosperity of the British hop-grower. That might, to a fairly accurate degree, be measured by the acreage under hop cultivation. In 1859, when the period of prosperity began, the hop acreage totalled something over 45,000, and in 1870 it had risen to just under 72,000 acres, so that there was an increase of over 26,000 acres during that period. At that time also, not only was there great prosperity at home, but there were no prohibitive tariffs against British hops in the markets of competing countries. British hops could and did hold their own not only in our own market but in all the hop markets of the world. The foreign growers then could not dump their surplus rubbish in our market, as they did to-day, without any liability of reprisal on our part. They sent us their hops, it was true, but they sent only their best, and then, as now, they marked their best hops. The influx of the worst type of foreign hop--the rubbish—did not commence until a long time after the Act was passed, and there was absolutely no occasion for the administrative powers placed in the hands of the Board of Agriculture to be set up as far as foreign hops were concerned. In 1879 the period of prosperity ceased and the period of depression set in. In that year came the heavy German tariff, and from that time might be dated the collapse of the British hop industry. Matters were made worse in 1883 when the United States passed their Tariff Revision Bill, which increased the tariffs in America as they had been increased in Germany. The McKinley tariff of 1890 and the Dingley tariff of 1897 did not improve matters, so that our hop industry went from bad to worse. In those early days the foreign markets were open to us in the same way as our markets were open to foreigners, and we were able, as he had said, to hold our own, so that no occasion arose to take any steps against the influx of foreign rubbish which was now dumped down here. Under the protective system which existed in other countries, foreign markets were secured from our competition, but they were able to send all their rubbish over to us, unmarked and mixed just as it suited them. We had cheap Belgian hops mixed with Bavarian hops, coming over to us in consignments unmarked, undated, and with no sort of warranty or guarantee, and the result was great injury to the British hop-growers and, indirectly, to many other classes of the community. The result of this "dumping," which began in 1879, and which had been gradually getting worse, was that the acreage of hops, which was nearly 72,000 in that year, had fallen to 46,000 acres, and was still falling, whilst British growers were absolutely powerless to prevent foreign rubbish coming into our markets and taking the bread, so to speak, out of their mouth. It might be said, as no doubt it would be said by the hon. Baronet, that the Select Committee which sat on the hop industry in 1890 reported against the marking of foreign hops. He would read the section of the Report in question. They said—

> "Evidence has been given as to the expediency of compelling the marking of foreign hops in the same manner as English-grown hops are marked. The foreign hops which are imported into this country come without any special marks guaranteeing the districts in which they are grown. Your Committee, however, are unable to see that the interest of English hop-growers can be promoted by requiring any certificate of origin of such foreign hops, thus giving greater security to purchasers of them."

He maintained that the reasoning there was absolutely false. Moreover, while the Committee based their opinion on their confidence that more prosperous times were at hand, matters had been steadily getting worse. The acreage figures before the Committee showed 57,700 under hops in this country, and it had now fallen to 46,000. That showed that the Committee were entirely wrong in their expectations, and he maintained that they were wrong in reporting against the marking of foreign hops. Another thing was that the relation of imports and exports had entirely changed. At the time the Act of 1866 was passed the imports of hops were 82,479 cwts. and the exports 21,012. In 1904, however, when the depression reached its climax, the imports were 313,667 cwts. and the exports only 13,878. The imports, therefore, were now more than twenty-four times the exports. That showed that the whole conclusions upon which the Select Committee based their Report had been falsified, and all their expectations had come to nothing. He maintained also that the reasons on which they based their expectations were quite wrong. Foreign hop growers were no fools, and if it had been to their advantage they would have marked their consignments voluntarily. He was perfectly aware that a number of them did so, but the hops so marked were only the best quality, and it was not the best quality that the British growers feared. What they objected to was the "dumping" of foreign rubbish on our markets. The allowing of foreign hops of inferior quality to come into our market free of restrictions had given rise to a most mischievous system of gambling in futures. That system, as far as hops were concerned, had struck the hardest blow that had ever been struck at the British industry. Forward contracts were made on foreign hops which it was impossible to make with British hops, because British growers could not guarantee to produce a certain amount of hops in any year. They might have a bad year and produce next to nothing, or they might have a good year and produce a heavy crop. Forward contracts, however, were freely entered into by foreign producers and were a source of much of the inferior hops which came into the British market. It was the opinion of many experts that if the regulations of the Act of 1866 were impartially applied to foreign and British hops it would have the effect of very largely checking that mischievous gambling, and stopping much of the inferior grade of hops coming into this country. The question was how were those regulations to be applied. The provisions of the Act imposed a liability on the vendor. Surely the vendor could look after himself, and see that the hops supplied to him were marked in the right way, and that they were up to the quality required. He would not take the risk of being liable for a fraud committed, not by himself, but by the foreign grower who had supplied him. They need not, therefore, consider the vendor. The obligation to mark the hops was there, and all he asked the Board of Agriculture to do was to apply it, and thus confer a lasting benefit upon the British hop industry. The Hop Trade Association was a powerful body in this country, and perfectly capable of testing the quality of foreign hops, and seeing that they were up to sample. At present, they could not do so, because they had received no assistance from the Government in the matter. If the Government would administer the Act of 1866 impartially, the Hop Association would be quite capable of meeting all the difficulties which might arise. He believed that the vast majority of the hop growers and hop factors, and a great many of the hop merchants in the country desired such a change. He had a letter from Mr. Griffiths, the Chairman of the Hereford and Worcestershire Hop Growers' Association, assuring him of the cordial support of all the growers in those counties, and asking if there was any way in which they could assist him in his efforts to get the Act applied impartially. Similar resolutions had been passed by innumerable farmers' clubs and agricultural associations throughout the various hop-growing counties, and he thought the vast majority, if not the whole, of the growers in this country approved of what he was doing. He did not pretend that there was no opposition, but opposing suggestions had all taken the same line as the Committee of 1890 took, saying that if marking regulations were imposed on foreign hops it would do the foreigner good rather than the English grower, because it would be a sort of Government guarantee. He had never heard such a ridiculous suggestion. When the Government imposed marking regulations with regard to margarine they did not make themselves liable. They merely said that the producer should state what the package contained, and should be liable if he made a false declaration. That was all they asked with regard to hops. There was no question of a Government guarantee. A very few words were sufficient to deal with the objections to his suggestion. It was not only a hop-growers' question; it was also a labour question. The hop industry was the most important industry as far as the agricultural labourer was concerned, for it employed more hands per acre than any other agricultural industry in existence. Anything which could be done, therefore, to help the hop industry would go far towards helping that movement which both sides of the House were so keen upon, viz., that of getting the people back to the land. It would also mean the employment of hundreds of thousands of people who lived in the slums of the great cities. At the time of hopping they went down into the country for six weeks, and had not only healthy, but profitable, employment. It was good for their pockets, for their health, and for their physique, and anything which could be done to re-establish the hop industry upon anything like its old basis would tend to improve the health of the people in the slums. He thought he might say on behalf of all sections of the community that anything that could be done to help the hop industry should be done. He only reminded the Board of Agriculture of a duty which already rested upon them, but which they had never discharged. He was sure the hon. Baronet representing the Board in the House of Commons would give the matter his consideration. It was not a Party question. He knew it might be suggested that he was asking for protection, but he could assure the Committee there was no question of Party in the matter at all. The movement was supported by all classes and parties in the hop-growing districts. He would read one letter he had received from a prominent Liberal and free trader in his own constituency. He was the Chairman of the Liberal Association there, and as such fought strenuously against him at the last general election, so that any accusation that this was a Party or protective matter fell to the ground. That gentleman had assisted him very largely in the movement, and, in fact, suggested that he should take action in the matter. He said—

> "If marking hops would prove an advantage to the foreigner, why does he not and why has he not marked them long ago? Is there anything to prevent him? Is he lacking in shrewdness? I think not. There is but one deduction to be drawn.
>
> "The fact is that marking would prevent the mixing, and this is an all-important point

which Mr. Amos has apparently lost sight of altogether. Our foreign competitors are free to mix hops of various qualities and sell them under the best name they can find, and they do so. Merchants and factors buy them and brewers use them.

"I have before me a circular issued by a large foreign firm where the lowest grades of continental hops are offered to their customers 'fit for mixing,' and showing a great saving in cost. Can such a thing be done here? I am glad to answer, No. And I contend that, just as margarine must be sold as such, and not as butter, so these hops should be sold for what they are, and nothing else.

"The 'forward contract' system would receive an effective blow, in my opinion, and brewers would buy English hops and consumers would drink good old English beer.

"I close with a recent quotation from Mr. Lloyd-George:—'Many a British industry has been completely wiped out by privileges conceded by our own institutions to foreigners.'

"Let us have fair play which is the essence of free trade."

This was a very pressing question, and he appealed, nay, more, he demanded, on behalf of the hop-growers of this country that the statutory restrictions which were applied to British hops should in future, as they ought to have been in the past, be applied to foreign hops.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries and Wages) be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Mr. ROGERS (Wiltshire, Devizes) said he wished to bring before the notice of the Committee the method in which the present swine fever regulations of the Board of Agriculture were operating in a number of counties. They were so restrictive in their character as to amount almost to prohibition of pig-breeding in many country districts. At present, anyone who wanted to move swine had to obtain an order, and it could only be obtained after a lapse of twenty-eight days. The conditions governing the industry, however, made it necessary to move swine at periods of twenty-one days, and the statutory period of twenty-eight days caused very great inconvenience, and in some cases hardship, upon a large number of deserving agriculturists, particularly small holders and farmers. He knew the Board of Agriculture were animated by great zeal in their crusade against swine fever, and he entirely sympathised with them in their object, but the regulations and restrictions which in the past the Board had put into force had been sufficient without their going to the present rigorous lengths to reduce swine fever. In 1892 there were 16,068 cases, and in 1905 there were only 817. In his own county in 1894 there were 256 cases and in 1905 there were only thirty-one cases. He therefore contended that the moderate restrictions the Board of Agriculture had hitherto imposed had been sufficient to effect an enormous improvement, and that it was quite unnecessary to go to any further length to stamp out the disease. The breeders themselves would very much welcome the eradication of the disease, but he submitted that the Board in approaching the question should give full value to the work done in the past. At present a number of people were bound to give up the breeding of pigs, and a large number were also saying that it would pay them very much better to defy the Board, move their swine, and pay the fine rather than incur the great pecuniary loss of keeping their swine without moving them. That, he submitted, would be a very undesirable state of things. He earnestly asked the hon. Baronet to see if he could not remove the more rigorous restrictions and continue to fight swine fever by the methods which had been so successful during the last fifteen or twenty years.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said he wished to confirm the remarks made by the hon. Member for Devizes. The question had excited a good deal of feeling in Wiltshire, and he had been approached by several important farmers in that county, who had asked him to bring the matter before the hon. Baronet. The hardship upon the farmers was undoubted. If they sent away a sow they were unable to move it again within a certain period, and consequently they were unable to obtain that number of litters in a year which made pig-breeding profitable. They asserted that that particular regulation did not assist the stopping of swine fever. The moving of the sow at twenty-one or twenty days instead of twenty-eight or twenty-nine days would not, they said, interfere with the eradication of swine fever; in fact, swine fever was generally propagated by store-pigs, and not by breeding sows. He did not know whether there was anything in that contention, but the feeling of the farmers of Wiltshire was so great that he was inclined to think they were correct. He gave the Board of Agriculture every credit for their endeavours to stop swine fever, and he recognised that certain inconveniences must arise; but he suggested that this particular regulation was not necessary, and that if the Board went back to the regulations which had hitherto existed with regard to breeding sows they would not spread swine fever, whilst they would assist farmers to carry on their business as pig-breeders. Pig-breeding was one of the most profitable agricultural industries, and, if they were to have small holdings, anything that would foster that industry should be carefully considered. He hoped the hon. Baronet would reconsider the regulations in question.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said he wished to ask the hon. Baronet if he had had under his consideration since the Estimates came on last year the question of sending to Wales Welsh-speaking inspectors, a matter on which he had spoken last session. He had now just returned from Wales, and knew this was a subject which very much interested his constituents. It was really a question of the first importance to them, or rather to certain localities in the district, because, as a matter of fact, the Welsh people were so constituted that they did not readily take to strangers, and in the remote districts where Welsh was perhaps the only language spoken they thought they ought to have a Welsh inspector. He urged the hon. Baronet, therefore, if it was impossible to send Welshmen, to send only non-Welshmen who could speak Welsh. Of course the majority of his constituents spoke both languages quite well, but in dealing with Welsh farmers and others inspectors could not supply satisfactory reports unless they could get into sympathy with the people amongst whom they had to work, and it was notorious that it was difficult for an Englishman to get on as well with people who did not understand Englishmen and their ways, or perhaps he should say preferred Welshmen and Welsh ways. The hon. Baronet had sympathetically replied to one or two questions he had asked him on this and on kindred subjects, and the question of issuing sheep-dipping notices in Welsh and other matters relating to Llanidloes had, he thought, been satisfactorily settled, but they felt that more could be done by making it certain that they did not send a man down to inspect their agricultural and other operations who could not speak the Welsh language. If the hon. Baronet would consult his colleague, the President of the Board of Trade, he was sure he would confirm what he (Mr. Rees) had said.

*DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey) thought he would be able to point out to the Committee that the Government itself was opposed to free trade and was supporting protection. Notices were issued prohibiting sheep and cattle from all other countries, except the United States and Canada, entering our markets even if they were killed on importation. That prohibition was very serious. It was very bad for the London worker and for the London consumer. The Deptford cattle market, like the Birkenhead cattle market, was established for the reception of cattle from abroad for immediate slaughter, and the large number of cattle and sheep coming into the market gave work to a large number of men, and the London consumer had fresh meat properly inspected placed before him. Butchers could go to the market and select from the stock the number of beasts and sheep they required, have them killed when they wanted and kept in the cool chambers until the Thursday or the Friday when they could be brought to the shop, so that the consumer had the meat placed at his disposal in the best possible condition. The existing prohibitive regulation had stopped the whole business of that market. It prohibited the importation of cattle and sheep from any European country, and hundreds of men who got their living from that market had been thrown out of work. It was a matter of great importance also to Bermondsey, whither 80 per cent. of the hides were sent, and where the result of the regulation had been to stop the supply of a large and regular supply of raw material. In that district the effect of the regulation had been disastrous, having resulted in the closing of several yards. He believed a Committee had, after a careful computation, arrived at the fact that as the result of the prohibition regulation at least 1,200 men had been thrown out of work, and it was stated on very good authority by persons who had looked into the matter that it meant that £200,000 a year had been lost in wages in consequence of the order. It was said by the Board of Agriculture that the farmers had lost £2,500,000 through foot-and-mouth disease. If the annual loss of wages arising from the closing of this market to sheep, etc., was multiplied by the years the market had been closed it would be found that labour had lost £2,000,000. It was true that cattle and sheep entered that market from the United States and Canada, but although a trade had been built up with those countries it was chiefly confined to cattle. Very few sheep came across as compared with the number that used to come from European countries. Last year only 2,375 came into that market from the United States and Canada, instead of the 800,000 which used to come before all sheep and cattle from European countries were prohibited. As cattle were now only allowed to be imported from the United States and Canada the control of the supply of beef had practically passed into the hands of the beef exporters in the United States, and the price of beef in London was controlled by about six firms in New York. His statements in that regard were confirmed by the market reports. If hon. Members looked at those they would find the statement "Deptford market, 17th April. No market to-day; 1,500 U.S. beasts kept back," and that occurred on several occasions. That was the case with regard to cattle; but it was very much worse with regard to sheep, when only 2,375 came into the market instead of 800,000. The consumers of mutton had to depend upon either the English supply or chilled carcases sent over from Holland, or frozen mutton, which was a very poor substitute for that killed at Deptford. Never was the price of mutton so high as at the present time. He found, upon looking at his paper, that the Scottish mutton on the previous day had been fetching in the market from 5s. to 6s. a stone by the carcase. That was from 8d. to 9d. a pound, which was an exceedingly high price by the carcase, and meant that a leg of mutton would be about 1s. 1d. a pound. He contended that the consumer suffered by the prohibition regulation, because it restricted the area of supply. There was, and could be, no legitimate reason why sheep and cattle from European countries which were officially declared to be free from foot-and-mouth disease should not be allowed to enter the country. In point of fact a preference was being given to the United States and Canada which amounted practically to protection. In his judgment, to maintain such a preference was a violation of the free-trade principle upon which the Government came into office. It was also protection for the British producer at the expense of the London consumer and the working man. The regulation was put into force in order to stamp out foot-and-mouth disease, and it was said that no cattle should come from any country where foot-and-mouth disease existed. Nobody desired that they should. All he contended was that cattle and sheep should be imported from European countries, where foot-and-mouth disease did not exist, in the same way as they were from the United States and Canada. The hon. Baronet last year stated that a case of foot-and-mouth disease was found in the Islington Cattle Market, and thirty-six hours afterwards another case was found in the Edinburgh Market and declared, although there was not a tittle of evidence to go upon, that the disease, in some mysterious way, was not only carried from Islington to Edinburgh, but had developed in thirty-six hours. Had the Board of Agriculture only consulted the veterinary surgeons on their staff, they would have known that the period of incubation of foot-and-mouth disease was from forty-eight hours to six days. It was true that the baccillus of foot-and-mouth disease had not been isolated, but neither had that of small-pox, and no one disputed that the incubatory period of small-pox was not well known. Still, he could not see why the Board of Agriculture should not accept the veterinary opinion that the period of incubation was from two to six days, and that the ordinary time was three days. He contended that no case had been made out against Deptford. The Board of Agriculture had never been able to trace the outbreak of a single case of foot-and-mouth disease that came from Deptford. It could not occur at Deptford. In the first place the cattle and sheep had to pass a veterinary inspection in the countries from which they came; they then had to be inspected here; and they could not leave the market alive, because the Act required them to be slaughtered within ten days. Besides which, in the countries from which, he contended, cattle should come the method of dealing with foot-and-mouth disease was much more strict than in this country. When a case of foot-and-mouth disease was found in Holland, the military were called out, a cordon was drawn round the farm, and no man or woman or living thing was allowed ingress or egress until the matter was dealt with. They disinfected the farm and burnt the hay and not only the cattle which had the disease, but those which had been in contact with them. But we were not allowed to import cattle from such a country as Denmark, where the rules in respect to foot-and-mouth disease were still more stringent because of their dairy industry. Upon all these grounds he could see no reason why the Board of Agriculture should not withdraw the existing prohibitory order and allow cattle and sheep exported from countries officially declared to be free from foot-and-mouth disease to come over for immediate slaughter. It was not asked that those cattle should come over for stock purposes, but that they should be admitted under the same conditions as those from the United States and Canada, and that the London consumer should have the advantage of active competition. Lord Carrington would serve a very useful purpose if, by a stroke of the pen, he allowed those cattle to come in, and by so doing put again a large number of men into employment.

*MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford) said he desired to appeal to the hon. Baronet from a purely labour point of view, and in making that appeal he believed he would have the support of the President of the Board of Agriculture, who in conjunction with the hon. Baronet had lately inspected the Deptford Cattle Market. During the inspection he had ascertained that so far as disease was concerned, it was not possible for any disease to come out of the market. The system of inspection was so stringent that he was assured that it would be impossible for any such risk to arise. The market was a city market, and cost nearly half a million to build, and he appealed strongly to the hon. Baronet, having regard to the unfortunate conditions prevailing there, to give the reasons advanced by his hon. friend fair consideration. He did not wish to suggest that it was a question of protection, but the fact remained that in both Holland and Denmark every precaution was taken to ensure that the cattle exported were free from disease, and he believed both countries had for some four or five years been officially declared to be free from disease. If that was so, combined with stringent inspection on this side, he failed to see how any possible risk could be run of spreading foot-and-mouth disease in this country. He asked the hon. Baronet for his favourable consideration, and trusted that, in the interests of labour, the Board of Agriculture would remove the restriction at the earliest possible moment.

*MR. JACKSON (Greenwich) said that although his hon. friends the Members for Bermondsey and Deptford had rather anticipated what he wished to say, he would venture to intervene in the debate, because he had the honour of presiding at a public meeting convened in November last, consisting of representatives of the neighbouring constituencies of Lewisham, Greenwich, Deptford and Woolwich, at which a resolution was passed urging on the President of the Board of Agriculture the immediate necessity of removing the restrictions on the importation of live cattle and sheep for the Deptford Cattle Market from countries which had been officially declared to be free from disease. Upon that occasion in the course of the discussion reference was made to a deputation which had waited on the President of the Board of Agriculture with regard to those restrictions. The deputation pointed out that they were prohibited from importing cattle from countries although those countries were officially declared to be free from disease, and that they desired the restriction to be removed. In reply the President of the Board of Agriculture said he did not think they would have to wait very long before they realised their desire. Some thought the time had now arrived when their desires in the matter should be realised, for it appeared from a letter from the Danish Minister to the Association for the Repeal of Unnecessary Restrictions at Deptford Cattle Market that there had been no case of foot-and-mouth disease in Denmark since July, 1904, and they were looking to the hon. Baronet for some encouragement in that direction. When they could refer to countries which had been declared officially to be free from disease they had a right, not in the interest of Bermondsey, or of Deptford, or of Greenwich, but of the whole country, to ask that the prohibition should be removed. The present system was one of absolute protection in regard to the cattle coming in from the United States and Canada He quite agreed with the Minister for Agriculture that where a country was not officially declared to be free from disease it was necessary to continue the restriction, and that it would mean a great expense to stamp out the disease if it was again brought in, but he thought the Minister for Agriculture should take upon himself the responsibility of allowing cattle to be imported from countries like Denmark which had been officially declared to be free from disease. There were several other countries in a similar position. There was no foot-and-mouth disease in Sweden, Denmark, Schleswig-Holstein, Hanover, Oldenburg, Westphalia, Holland or the Rhine provinces. His contention was that the question affected the whole country, and that anything of a prohibitive character where no danger was likely to arise from the importation of live cattle was nothing more nor less than protection. It was no local question, although incidentally it affected many trades—fellmongers, tanners, and others—which were only matters of local importance; it affected the population of London and prevented them having a large and proper supply of food. As Lord Carrington had already expressed the view that if any place was officially declared to be free from disease there was no reason why cattle should not be imported therefrom, then so far as Denmark and the other countries he had mentioned were concerned they had made out a case with regard to which he hoped they would get some satisfactory reply from the hon. Baronet.

*MR. PARTINGTON (Derbyshire, High Peak) said he desired to draw attention to what had been done in the way of co-operation in regard to small holdings. He recognised what had been done by the Board of Agriculture for the promotion of small holdings, and he believed that a bill was shortly to be brought in which would facilitate matters in that respect. But he could not help thinking that such a Bill would not be very beneficial unless something was done to start co-operative societies among the smallholders who were to be set up. Co-operation had done much in the past in helping such men to dispose of their produce and in giving them an opportunity of purchasing seeds and manures in the best markets, and without co-operation they could not expect small farmers to solve the difficult problem of marketing their produce. Denmark and Ireland supplied proofs of that contention. The great agricultural prosperity of Denmark was due to a very large extent to the system of co-operation in that country. In Ireland the Irish Agricultural Oganisation Society had, as a result of its work in that direction, about ninety branches in different parts of Ireland and a turnover of something like £2,000,000. The Irish Department of Agriculture had given valuable assistance and several grants of money to that Society, and he hoped the Board of Agriculture would give equal assistance to a similar organisation in this country.

*SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said it was a fallacy to place reliance altogether on official declarations that any particular country was free from cattle disease, unless there was a guarantee that along the entire frontiers of the country from which these cattle were exported there was no risk of infection. An official declaration that an area was free from disease at a particular moment would not be sufficient reason for cancelling existing regulations. That would be a most dangerous ground for the Board of Agriculture to adopt for doing anything of the kind. The matter, it was said, had been brought before the House both in the general interest of the community and in the interest of localities in which hardships had been caused by the existing regulations. By those regulations it was extremely probable that losses and hardships were inflicted on groups of individuals and certain districts, but in determining a national policy upon a matter of supreme importance the interests of the whole country had to be considered. Looking at the question from that point of view, he could not but consider it would be inexpedient and unwise to relax the regulations and allow the possibility of a return of such a disaster to the agriculture of the country as occurred in the seventies. Any one who had gone into the history of those times and had considered the enormous losses that had been inflicted on agriculture and the community generally must have come to the conclusion that anything approaching the condition of things which existed then would be an incalculable disaster. But they had to look further and consider the whole of the interests of the community, as well as the prosperity of agriculture. As corn growing became unprofitable, agriculture had only been able to hold its own by the rearing of fat stock and dairy farming. Let Members consider the effect of the admission of the seeds of foot-and-mouth disease into the areas from whence London drew its milk supply and dairy produce. He knew some of the large farmers in Wilts and elsewhere, who sent anything from 1,000 to 3,000 gallons of milk every day to London. To run the risk of starting an epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease or pleuro-pneumonia on the farms from which those quantities of milk were supplied to our great centres of population would be ruinous to the farmers concerned, but more serious still would be the result to the population of London and of our large towns. To the community at large it would be disastrous.

DR. COOPER said he thought the hon. Member had misunderstood his argument. He was only asking for repeal of the regulation affecting cattle for immediate slaughter, not for cattle generally.

*SIR F. CHANNING said he understood hon. Members had been arguing for the cancellation of the regulations. He would press his point no further than saying that the Board of Agriculture, if it yielded to the pressure for relaxation of the regulations, would commit a very serious and dangerous blunder. He was not aware that any regulation seriously interfered with the supply of cattle for immediate slaughter. There were one or two other topics upon which he hoped to obtain some information from the Department. He found fault with the Treasury for withholding the financial support necessary for dealing with the outbreak of glanders. On the other hand, he was glad to notice that the Board of Agriculture had carried out valuable experiments with a view to obtaining control over the ravages of anthrax. He desired to know whether those experiments and the inferences to be drawn from them as detailed in the important Report issued by the Board last summer were being carried further, and were likely to result in practical action in the way of legislation or administrative orders for the better protection of cattle from that scourge. The suggestions made in the Report that the disease was caused in some cases by infected feeding stuffs and cakes, and in other cases by the contamination of many refuse materials by which presumably human beings also were being infected, pointed the way to further inquiries and to more effective measures of stamping out. If that were not so, he thought the time had arrived for a departmental scientific inquiry into anthrax. He wished also to ask as to one of the most urgent and pressing questions of the day — agricultural education— whether the Board was attempting to arrive at a working arrangement with the Board of Education. It was essential that there should be a Joint Committee of the two Boards to direct the development of agricultural education. As it was now there was no real co-ordination and the institutions subsidised by the Board were deprived of half their utility. He was glad that the Government were about to introduce legislation for the encouragement of small holdings, but he feared that, without a wider and more thorough system of agricultural education, their efforts would be almost fruitless. The money at the disposal of the Board of Agriculture for educational purposes was wholly inadequate; and he hoped pressure would be brought to bear upon the Treasury to give a larger grant for the purpose.

MR. EVERETT (Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that, as the representative of a county where swine-feeding was one of the most profitable parts of agriculture, he joined in the hope which had been expressed that the Board of Agriculture, in dealing with swine fever, would endeavour to cause as little inconvenience as possible to farmers engaged in the industry.

MR. E. GARDNER (Berkshire, Wokingham) said there was no matter of greater importance or upon which the agricultural industry of this country felt more keenly than that of protection against disease. He thought the right hon. Member for Wimbledon, if he were rightly credited with having by a stroke of the pen brought about the condition of affairs under which we had lived for the last three or four years, ought to be very proud of his achievement. Those who brought forward that scheme had no idea or very little of what an outbreak of foot-and-mouth-disease really meant. The hon. Member for Southwark had said that if the restriction were removed by the Board of Agriculture, disease could not be spread from the market, because the beasts would be killed there. How could anyone make a statement of that kind unless he proposed to disinfect every man who had anything to do with the market? It was well known that the disease could be carried out in the clothes, and if that was so, and the disease made its appearance in Deptford Market, it was impossible to say that it could be isolated there. He was sorry to be in opposition to the hon. Member for Bermondsey or to any of those people who might by regulation of the kind complained be hampered in getting their living; but in this case they came into competition with the great industry of agriculture, which employed the largest number of people of any industry in the country, and the interests of Bermondsey were not to be compared with the interests of agriculture as a whole. It might be true that there was little danger of foot-and-mouth disease being introduced by live cattle from such countries as Belgium, Holland or Denmark, but if the disease were once introduced the danger would be enormous, and it was the dread of the introduction of the disease and the amount of mischief it would do if introduced that led him to urge upon the Board of Agriculture that they should stand firm against any relaxation of the provisions against the importation of live cattle. One hon. Member had spoken of the great industries which had grown up during the last twenty years round the Deptford Cattle Market, but there was nothing of more importance to the population of the country as well as the agricultural industry than that the dairying industry, which was valuable, should be carried out on lines that would enable those who were engaged in it to produce an article under conditions which the medical authorities could approve. In the little homesteads, where five or ten animals were kept, they could never have that sanitary condition of things that was to be found in larger places. The owners of the small places could not afford the sanitary appliances which the larger places could. If the regulations were relaxed, and it got into the minds of those engaged in the dairying industry that disease might ensue, we should never again secure the existence of the large herds of cattle which had hitherto existed, and he could conceive nothing more disastrous to the growing population of the country than that they should in that way be deprived of their milk supply. What was the main desire of all those who looked for the welfare of the race at the present day in regard to the physical bringing up of the people of the country? It was that they should have a plentiful and cheap supply of pure, good milk. He had ventured to assert in other assemblies, and he now did so in the House of Commons, that if they could get half a pint of good, pure milk into the stomachs of the children in the towns as well as of those in the country, they would be doing them more good than by the education they were trying to stultify them with. [Laughter.] Hon. Members laughed at that, but they should see the difference between the two classes of children—those who got the education and those who got the milk. They would not be able to get a sufficient supply unless there was a sense of security on the part of those who were able to produce it, and that they would not get if they adopted proposals such as that brought forward on that occasion. Although he differed from the hon. Baronet in politics, he was sure from what he knew of him that he would protect the various interests of agriculture which had been brought before the House that afternoon.

*MR. BECK (Cambridgeshire, Wisbech) wished to associate himself with what had been said about any relaxation of the regulations as to the importation of cattle. He was sure that any feeling of insecurity among stock-breeders would be a calamity to agriculture.

The matter which he, however, was immediately concerned in bringing forward was as to whether some steps could not be taken to carry out the recommendations of the Committee upon fruit culture which reported in 1905. It was urged by that Committee that a sub-department of the Board of Agriculture should be appointed for the purpose of dealing with that subject, and that the interests of fruit growers should be dealt with by a bureau which should give information in regard to markets and so forth. He was convinced that the industry of fruit growing was one which deserved the earnest support of the Board of Agriculture. He knew that the Board had had the matter at heart. He pointed out, however, that it was not only a growing industry, but one which employed a large number of people and therefore did something to check the flow of the rural population into the towns, a tendency which they all so much deplored. He brought the matter forward on the same Estimates last session, and the hon. Baronet promised to consider it. He hoped that that consideration had led to something which would result in the recommendations of the Committee of 1905 being carried out. He also called attention to the hardship which resulted in cases of swine erysipelas. That not being a scheduled disorder, farmers received no compensation when animals were destroyed. Cases of that kind had occurred in his own constituency and he urged that the disease should be scheduled. He feared it was too late to do anything for the Chatteris sufferers, but hoped no other pig growers would be exposed to similar hardship.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): In discussing the Amendment of the hon. Member for Rye in regard to the hop industry, I must say at the outset that it is a question whether it is not more a subject of legislation than of administration. I do not wish, at the same time, to raise the technical question that the Board of Agriculture has no power to consider and deal with the conditions of this industry; I merely wish to enter a *caveat* against the ideas that there is any obligation at all under the present Act imposed upon the Board of Agriculture, or that the Board has in any way departed from any duty imposed upon them by legislation. The hon. Gentleman has referred to the question of marking imported hops, and of course it is very possible that when there was a duty upon imported hops there may have been some necessity for the marking of them. The hon. Member also referred to the decrease of acreage under hop cultivation, but that is due to the fact that in very prosperous years a great deal of land was planted with hops which was entirely unsuited for their cultivation, and which cannot compete with the best growing land abroad or in this country, just as is well known a great deal of pasture was ploughed up during the time of the Corn Laws which has been returned to pasture simply because it is not fitted for corn. The same thing may be said about the growing of hops upon unsuitable land. My hon. friend also referred to the Report of the Hop Industry Committee, but with his usual acumen and acuteness he saw at once that that Report disposes of a considerable portion of his argument. But he went on to point out that the prophecy of the Committee of more prosperous times has been falsified. It is a very dangerous thing indeed to prophesy, because as a rule prophecies turn out to be wrong, but it is quite a different thing to make a statement upon evidence. The Hop Industry Committee reported as follows—

> "Evidence has been given as to the expediency of compelling the marking of foreign hops in the same manner as English grown hops are marked. The foreign hops which are imported to this country come without any special marks guaranteeing the districts in which they are grown. Your Committee, however, are unable to see that the interest of English hop growers can be promoted by requiring any certificate of origin of such foreign hops and thus giving greater security to purchasers of them."

There were some gentlemen of great knowledge and experience of the industry on that Committee. Mr. Shaw Lefevre was the chairman, and the members were Mr. Agg-Gardner, Mr. Biddulph, Mr. (now Sir Francis) Channing, Sir Guyer Hunter, Mr. Edward Knatchbull-Hugessen, Sir Wilfred Lawson, Sir Edmund Lechmere, Sir Roper Lethbridge, Mr. Long, Mr. Jasper More, Mr. Norton, Mr. O'Keefe, Mr. Pomfret, Sir Henry Roscoe, Mr. Stack, and lastly Mr. Brookfield, who had the honour to represent the division which the hon. Gentleman now represents. All of us who sat in this House with Mr. Brookfield know what an expert he was, and what a thorough knowledge of hops he had, and yet he concurred in the Report of that Committtee. I do not think therefore that the Board of Agriculture can be expected to agree with the hon. Member in holding that the Committee was probably wrong. I very much doubt, also, if the marking of foreign hops will prevent gambling, which takes place on the corn market just in the same way as on the hop market. The hon. Member said that the vast majority of hop-growers desired this change, and he said that the Herefordshire and Worcestershire Hop Growers' Association were in favour of it. If that is the case, I cannot help thinking that it must be a new development, and that their interest in the matter cannot be very great, for they have never made any representation to the Board of Agriculture on the subject. I cannot agree with the hon. Member that the vast majority of hop growers desire a change, when we know that in the county of Kent some of the principal hop growers have declared that they do not want any alteration of the law. As far as it is possible to judge from private investigations, from statements at meetings and in the Press, the growers of Kent, which, after all, it will be allowed is the great county in regard to hops, do not want any alteration. When great hop growers like Mr. Amos and Mr. Berry declare that they do not want any alteration of the law, that is apparent. It is being stated at meetings in Kent, and I am not sure it is not being said in Sussex also, that so far from a change being of any advantage it will be a disadvantage and do harm to the trade of the English hop grower. It is thought that it will have very much the same effect as the Merchandise Marks Act, and that its only effect will be to advertise foreign goods, and that is the reason why hop growers in Kent think that instead of this marking being of any assistance to them it will be the reverse. I do not think the arguments which have been advanced will receive very much support from hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, when one remembers that though there is a great deal of labour in the hop industry, it is of a casual character, and I do not think Labour Members would wish to encourage casual employment, which leads to periods of misery and distress. As regards the question of swine fever, raised by my hon. friend the Member for East Wiltshire, I can assure him and the hon. Baronet opposite that the Board of Agriculture is taking the greatest possible interest in it. Indeed, if it be any satisfaction to the hon. Gentlemen, I may state that I am personally interested, because in my own county of Somerset there has been a serious outbreak of swine fever, and the whole of the county has been declared an infected area. Therefore, the Committee may feel assured that in reference to this matter I am not only as anxious but as sympathetic as I can be, and I can only say that the restrictions imposed will be such as are absolutely necessary for the purpose of stamping out the disease. My hon. friend the Member for East Wiltshire has referred to the question of sows sent to a farm for breeding purposes. I think the hon. Gentleman is under a misapprehension on this subject. Another hon. Member wrote to me the other day to the effect that suppose a sow were sent to a farm for breeding purposes, then until after twenty-eight days no other sow might be sent to that farm. That is not so. The fact is this. If a sow is taken to a farm no other pigs may be removed from that farm until after twenty-eight days; but that does not prevent another sow from being taken to the farm. And very often, at any rate in the case of large farms, the landlord, anxious to benefit his tenant and the people living around, and at the same time not to hamper his own business as a seller of pigs, takes means to isolate the boar at some distance, so that there is no necessity for isolating the whole of the premises. I think difficulties can be got over, but at the same time the Board are strongly of opinion that the restriction that no sow should be sent off a farm until the lapse of twenty-eight days after other pigs have been sent to it, is one that ought to be retained. Of course, I am aware it is said that the present orders are too stringent, and that the older orders were quite sufficient. I might have been inclined to think that, also, some few weeks ago but for what has taken place in my own county of Somerset. The restrictions which existed have not been sufficient to prevent a very serious outbreak indeed in that county. I would refer my hon. friend the Member for East Wiltshire, who thinks these restrictions have been sufficient for the whole country, to the figures which bear on the matter. In 1905 there were 292 outbreaks of swine fever, and 1,399 swine were affected. Last year there were 474 outbreaks and 2438 swine were affected. Taking twenty weeks in 1907, there had been 874 outbreaks, and 4,419 swine were affected. It will be seen from those figures that, whatever the cause, undoubtedly swine fever has increased in a very unsatisfactory way; and, therefore, it will be necessary for the Board of Agriculture to maintain existing restrictions. But I can assure hon. Gentlemen that neither the Board, nor, I think, the local authorities, have any desire to make those restrictions more stringent than is absolutely necessary to meet the outbreak. We have every reason to hope, however, that with stringent precautions we shall be able to combat and stamp out the disease, which, for some reason or another that we cannot at present account for, has again broken out. We hope to get a thorough grasp of the disease, and, after a time, we may possibly be able to relax the more stringent regulations of which hon. Members to some extent complain. But I can hold out no hope of that at the present moment.

SIR F. BANBURY said the hon. Gentleman had not understood, apparently, their point with regard to sending a sow to the boar. Their point was that it might be necessary to send the sow again, and, though they had been able to do that hitherto, now they could not do it.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I perfectly understood the hon. Baronet's point. If when a sow has been sent to a farm, other pigs are brought to the premises, then it cannot be removed until after the lapse of twenty-eight days; but if no pigs have been brought to the farm, then it can be removed. That is where the difficulty arises. It is curious to note that it is not only in this country that there have been outbreaks of swine fever, but there has been a case in Ireland. I can assure hon. Members that the Board of Agriculture are anxious, and I personally am anxious, that the restrictions shall be worked with as little friction as possible. We are desirous of working hand in hand with the local authorities, and of giving as little trouble as possible to agriculturists, in our efforts to stamp out the disease. In reference to the question raised by the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs, in regard to the appointment of inspectors who know the Welsh language, my hon. friend is doubtless aware that advertisements have been inserted in the Welsh papers, and every effort made to meet the feelings of the Welsh people on this particular matter of appointing inspectors who have a knowledge of the Welsh tongue, if those appointed are properly qualified in other respects. [AN HON. MEMBER: Are there enough of them?] If there are not enough of them, that raises an entirely different question, and it is one which shall be looked into. I can assure the hon. Member that no one is more anxious than my noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture to meet the feelings of the Welsh people on this point. Reference has been made to the restriction of the importation of foreign cattle, and I should like to say at once that nobody can be a stronger free-trader than I am; but I think my hon. friend who raised the point is entirely under a misapprehension with regard to it, and I think he must realise, after the speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Northamptonshire, who is one of the strongest free-traders on these benches, that this is not at all a question of free trade or protection in the ordinary sense of the word. The only way in which it is protection is that the protection is against disease, and I hope the hon. Member is sufficiently a protectionist to desire protection against disease. In regard to the question as to the number of cattle and sheep coming into Deptford market, I have a Report made by the Corporation of the City of London Cattle Markets Committee, which contains a Return showing in 1897 an increase of 3,716 cattle, and a decrease of 12,121 sheep. It is doubtful whether there is any large supply of Continental cattle available for import into this country at the present time—that is to say, if there was no restriction as regards European cattle. It is quite true that at one time Germany sent large numbers to this country, but at the present time she now imports from Demark and the Netherlands, and takes all the cattle which we formerly got from Schleswig-Holstein. American cattle slaughtered at Deptford are sent to Germany at a profit notwithstanding the duty. Denmark is now much more a dairying than a grazing country. Taking the average of the years 1883–4–5, we imported from Denmark 94,376 cattle as against an average for 1889–90–91 of 63,873. If we take the case of sheep for the last twenty years, we find that the average for the three years, 1883, 1884, and 1885, was 84,000 imported from Denmark, and that total fell in the three years 1889, 1890 and 1891, to 70,000. In the year 1876, when there was no transatlantic competition, we imported from the Netherlands 86,000 cattle, and 412,675 sheep. The average for the three years 1883, 1884 and 1885 was 42,000 cattle and 223,000 sheep. During the three years, 1889, 1890 and 1891, when the importation from the Netherlands was free we imported an average of 40,959 cattle and 175,431 sheep. Now what has been the cause of the falling off in the supplies from Europe, when there was no prohibition? I believe it is entirely owing to the Transatlantic competition, as well as to the growing population and wealth of European countries. In 1876 we imported from the United States for slaughter and distribution 392 cattle, and no sheep at all; from Canada 2,557 cattle and 1,826 sheep. In 1881 we imported from America 103,673 cattle and 49,223 sheep; and from Canada 44,383 cattle and 66,487 sheep. The last year in which there was this free importation was 1891, and in that year we imported 314,838 cattle from America, and 10,550 sheep, and from Canada 108,286 cattle and 31,664 sheep. These figures show that in the year 1876 Continental countries, with no competition from the United States or Canada, imported 266,849 cattle, whilst in the year 1891 with competition they only imported in round numbers 79,000 cattle, or a decrease of 186,869 cattle from America and Canada. America and Canada imported in 1876, 392 cattle, and in 1891 that total had increased to 425,824 in cattle alone. But this is not only a question of importation of live cattle and sheep for slaughter, but we have to consider the importation of dead meat as well. This becomes a very important factor when it is said that we are by these regulations restricting our food supplies and causing the price of food to go up. In 1876 the amount of dead meat imported was 788,973 cwts., the proportion of sheep not being distinguished. In 1891 the total was 4,450,572 cwts. of cattle and 1,728,067 cwts. of sheep. In 1896 we imported the enormous total of 10,112,672 cwts. of cattle and 4,131,199 cwts. of sheep.

DR. COOPER: Does that include frozen meat?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: There is no doubt that a large amount of that is frozen meat, but there is a good deal of it chilled. I have heard it said that frozen mutton is a very poor substitute indeed for English meat. I think, however, that the Committee will agree with me that there is a good deal of very good frozen and chilled beef consumed in this country which has been an enormous boon to the working classes. Not only is this meat good, but the poor people are able to buy it at very low and reasonable prices, and I am only too anxious to see that the working classes get the fullest possible benefit from its importation. The only objection which the President of the Board of Agriculture takes to the suggestion that these restrictions should be removed is that the Disease of Animals Act of 1894, which was passed by a Liberal Government, lays the obligation upon the Board of Agriculture to prohibit the importation of animals for slaughter from any country in which foot-and-mouth disease exists, or in which the sanitary regulations are such as not to afford reasonable security against the risk of the introduction of the disease. The reason why the President of the Board of Agriculture at the present moment refuses to allow cattle to come in from Europe to be slaughtered is because he feels that the obligation laid upon him is one which he must abide by, and until my noble friend is satisfied that the importation asked for from Europe, where foot-and-mouth disease exists, can take place without the risk of introducing disease it is the duty of the Government to maintain the present exclusion. A reference has been made to a deputation which was received by Lord Carrington last year, but the interpretation which has been placed upon what my noble friend said upon that occasion has given a wrong impression, and in justice to him I think it is necessary that I should read what he did say. His actual words were—

> "I quite understand your point. I sympathise with the desire of the Deputation, but I feel that I cannot take upon myself the responsibility of holding out any hope of doing what you wish."

During the autumn session of 1906 I was asked a question about allowing cattle to be imported from the Netherlands, which at the time was altogether free from disease. I then pointed out that there was no effective boundary between the Netherlands and other parts of Europe where foot-and-mouth disease was prevalent, and, as at any moment there might be an outbreak in those other countries, it was impossible for the Board to run the risk of introducing foot-and-mouth disease into this country. It so happened that a very short time afterwards there was a serious outbreak in the Netherlands. From 1892 to 1902 foot-and-mouth disease was continuously prevalent in all parts of the Netherlands, the highest number of animals attacked in one year being 868,215 and the lowest 917. From 1903 to 1905 the disease almost entirely disappeared, but it suddenly recurred in November, 1906, when no less than 106 animals were affected during the months of November and December in the province of Limburg. It is important to remember that across the border, in Germany, foot-and-mouth disease is almost continuously prevalent, although there has been no cases of the disease in Denmark since 1904, when twenty-one animals were affected in the province of Praesto. Taking Europe as a whole, it may be said that foot-and-mouth disease is indigenous; there does not appear any reasonable prospect in the near future of stamping it out altogether, and therefore it is obviously necessary that the Board of Agriculture should maintain the restrictions. Foreign countries generally are rather inclined to recognise that we are justified in taking these precautions. Hon. Members may be certain that Lord Carrington is only too anxious to meet the wishes of London and London Members, with whom he has worked on the County Council; and it is only a sense of duty that compels him to keep the regulations in force at the present moment. There would be great risk of disease if the regulations were removed. There is a great deal of risk to be feared from men going about among diseased cattle and spreading the disease. This danger is not confined to animals, but distress and suffering are often caused to human beings through the transmission of disease. I know a case in which a man, after visiting an infected area, came back to his farm and went into his dairy and cowshed without changing his clothes, and in that way brought foot-and-mouth disease to his farm. The Edinburgh case which was referred to by my hon. friend is a small matter. We said thirty-six, and it has been stated that we ought to have said forty-eight. I would say to my hon. friend that that is a case in which doctors differ. It is certainly not for laymen like the noble Earl and myself to say that we refuse, or object to continue, to act on the advice of our advisers. We say that the risk of infection being carried is very great. This terrible disease may be carried to different parts of the country by the men and the customers who are going among the cattle. There can be no doubt that it is a most infectious disease, and it brings a great deal of distress and suffering not only to the animals themselves, but sometimes, as is well known, to people, who manifest the symptoms of the disease and suffer in the same way as the animals do. It is, therefore, a question which interests not only farmers, but the general population, and it is of the greatest importance that we should not allow the disease to spread. It has been said that in this particular case we should relax the regulations, because of the difficulty in connection with the want of employment. When the noble Earl and myself went down to Deptford we were sorry to find that there were 600 unemployed men who might have been in employment if this leakage, or rather this shortage of sheep, could have been filled up by the importation of sheep from abroad. But my hon. friend did not bring forward any proposal to show how a larger number could be imported. At the present moment I think the real difficulty in regard to the men at Deptford is that there is a general shortage of sheep in America and Canada, and, that being so, fewer are being imported. On the other hand, I would remind my hon. friend that on the question of labour there is a better outlook. It is expected that more sheep will be brought when the Panama Canal is constructed. Hon. Members may say: "That seems to be a long way off;" but I may tell them that agents representing dealers and producers have been making inquiries at the Deptford market as to the bringing of sheep from Australia and New Zealand by ships using the Panama Canal when it is opened. In that way the passage will be shortened, and it will be possible to bring a large number of sheep to the market at Deptford. No one can regret more than I do the want of employment at this particular place owing to the shortage of sheep. But, supposing that foot-and-mouth disease were brought into the country in consequence of the importation of animals from abroad, it would mean want of employment, not to 600, but to thousands of men. It is generally admitted that the agricultural interest is not in a very flourishing state, and if you had an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease all over the country you would have farmers ruined, and that would mean to agricultural labourers being thrown out of employment. They would be hard hit, and they are a class the Government are anxious to benefit. I venture to say to my hon. friends of the Labour Party that if they went in to any meeting composed of agricultural labourers, people dependent on agriculture, and suggested the mere idea of running the risk of bringing foot-and-mouth disease once more into this country, the idea would be received with the greatest horror, because many of them, unfortunately, have had experience of what the disease means. They know perfectly well that, in the present state of things, if there was a serious outbreak it would mean ruin to the farmers and also to them. I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that you could not get any meeting of people connected with agriculture to support any such proposal. My hon. friend has referred to the case of butchers who used to go and buy small lots, and he rather suggested that it was owing to the restrictions on cattle coming from Europe that the system on which they conducted their business had been interfered with. That has nothing to do with it. It arises out of the action of the companies who have control of the cattle trade at the present time. They have been able to squeeze out those who buy on commission. I have been told that these people—they are a very small number in America—arrange not only to send over cattle to this country, but that if they cannot be sold at the prices they expect they are withheld. It may be said that under the regulations they must be slaughtered within ten hours. That is true, and they are slaughtered and put into cold storage rooms and kept there, and so thoroughly organised are the great trusts that they are even ready to send out portions of the carcase to small traders in different parts of the country. There is another point in regard to the price of meat to which I wish to refer. If you take the index number as 100, you will find that in the year 1876 the price of beef was 111·6, and the price of mutton, 118·3. If you take the year 1896 the price of beef was 82·2, and the price of mutton 81·5. Another year afterwards the prices were: beef, 83·7, and mutton, 95·8.

DR. COOPER asked the hon. Gentleman to state why the Board of Agriculture had given a preference to the United States over European countires in the importation of cattle. It was a well-known fact that outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease had occurred in the New England States, and yet the Board of Agriculture had not prevented the importation of cattle from those parts.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The Board of Agriculture has given no preference at all to America. The only difference between America and countries in Europe is that in America you may have an isolated case a long way off, whereas in the case of European countries the danger is more immediate. If the Board of Agriculture thought that there was the slightest danger of the disease being brought to this country through the importation of cattle from America, they would have the same restrictions imposed on American imports as on those from European countries. At the present moment the Board of Agriculture are perfectly satisfied that as regards Canada and the United States there is not the slightest danger in importing cattle for slaughter from these two countries. As regards the question raised by the hon. Member for Derbyshire, I can assure him that it will be considered. As regards what has been said by the hon. Member for Northamptonshire, he is perfectly well aware of the present state of things as set out in the Report of the Committee. My Board are considering the present situation and what should be done in view of the fact that the Treasury has refused to make any grant in connection with the matter. As regards the question of anthrax and the various sources from which it arises, I have to say that the question is being very carefully considered. The hon. Member praised the valuable Report which has lately been issued, and asked whether I could do anything to carry out greater preventive measures than are in operation at the present moment. I do not think it desirable to say anything further about what is said in that Report except that the Board will consider whether anything can be done by legislation or administration. At the present moment experiments could be made at the experimental farm at Sunbury. The question of making experiments is being considered. I think the hon. Member will see that there again it would be very difficult for the Board of Agriculture with its small resources to go in for investigation and experiment. I can only hope that the hon. Gentleman will press the Treasury to provide funds, for the Board of Agriculture are perfectly well aware of the necessity and the importance of being furnished with greater funds for the purpose of carrying out these experiments in the interest of the protection of the flocks and herds from a disease which is also very dangerous to human beings. As regards the question of a Departmental Committee, I do not think the hon. Gentleman can expect me to say anything on that point at the present moment. I can assure him that the question will be fully considered. I do not think we could do much through a Departmental Committee in inquiring into questions in relation to the disease unless more funds are placed at our disposal. There is no doubt that the Board would be only too glad to carry out experiments if they had the necessary funds. My hon. friend asked a question as to whether a separate section could not be created to look after the interests of the fruit industry. That might be done if all the officers of the Department were under one roof. That is not the case at the present moment; but we are anxious to do all we can to advance the interest of the British fruit industry. I think I have now dealt with all the questions which had been brought before the Committee; and I trust that as regards this specially important matter in relation to foot-and-mouth disease and pleuro-pneumonia, I have shown the reasons why the President of the Board of Agriculture cannot hold out any hope of the restrictions being relaxed at present. That was from no want of sympathy with the views of hon. Members, but because of the difficulties that have arisen in connection with the introduction of live cattle and sheep for immediate slaughter in our ports.

*MR. COURTHOPE said he was not at all content with the hon. Baronet's answer. He had said that one reason for upholding the Report of the Committee of 1890 as to the marking of foreign hops, was that Colonel Brookfield, who was a great expert on the subject, sat upon that Committee. That was true, but the hon. Baronet forgot that Colonel Brookfield himself proposed an alternative Report to that presented by the Committee, which he strenuously opposed by voting against it on every possible opportunity.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: Not on this particular point.

*MR. COURTHOPE said that Colonel Brookfield was not present on the day that particular paragraph was carried. The hon. Baronet had further said that the hop growers of Kent did not desire the Board to take action. He believed they would soon take steps to convince the Board of their demand. Although not satisfied with the Government's answer he would not press the proposed reduction.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

*DR. COOPER moved the reduction of the Vote by £100.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Member had better move a reduction on the whole Vote, and not one of the same amount on this particular item.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the reduced sum of £77,740 be granted for the said service."—(*Dr. Cooper.*)

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Alban's) congratulated the hon. Baronet on the firm attitude he had taken up on the subject of foot-and-mouth disease. All those who were really interested in agriculture, which was the greatest industry in the country, must feel that the hon. Baronet had done the right thing. He was sure that every hon. Member felt that money spent on the support of agriculture was well invested; but he wanted some explanation as to why there had been increases in the clerks on the staff and why two map-mounters had been appointed at a salary of £172. Map-mounting used to be done by the printing contractor.

*DR. COOPER said that the question raised by him was very important and he was afraid that the answer of the hon. Baronet was by no means satisfactory. The hon. Baronet had said that when he went to Deptford no information was given him as to any importation of sheep into that port.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY said that what he had stated was that the hon. Gentleman in the House had not given the Department any idea of the amount of importation of cattle and sheep at Deptford.

*DR. COOPER asked whether they could give information of that kind until merchants had the opportunity—of which the Order of the Agriculture Board deprived them—of showing what the importation would be? If facilities were given by a relaxation of the order, the trade from continental countries would spring up to its former proportions. The hon. Baronet had said that frozen mutton was not a bad sort of food. Why then was it not provided in the House? If it was so good, why should not the Chairman of the Kitchen Committee immediately order a supply for hon. Members in the dining-room? And why not buy chilled meat. At the same time he had no doubt that hon. Members ate chilled meat when they imagined they were eating English fresh-killed meat. However, whether it was as nutritious or not, chilled meat did not fetch the same price in the market as fresh beef and mutton killed at the Deptford and Birkenhead foreign cattle market which was a fair test of what the trade and consumer thought about fresh as compared with chilled or frozen meat. He could not see why European countries, which had the most drastic regulations as to the spread of disease either amongst cattle or sheep, should not be allowed the privilege granted to the United States and Canada, of importing cattle and sheep into our ports for immediate slaughter. The meat market was at present in the hands of an American meat trust. They might have 1,500 or 2,000 head of cattle on hand, but if their price could not be obtained they killed the animals and sent the carcases to cold storage. If there was no danger of foot-and-mouth disease as in the case of Holland and Denmark, their cattle ought not to be excluded in favour of those coming from America. Cattle from those countries went into Germany and other cattle-breeding countries. All he asked was that the same facilities should be offered to European countries which were officially declared free from disease as were given to the United States. The hon. Baronet had said that serious damage might arise to the agricultural interest, but, meanwhile the sum of money the town worker lost in wages and the increased price the consumer had to pay more than counterbalanced that loss, and the total represented the sum the consumers of London alone had to pay to protect the landowners' interests. He was surprised to hear that the present Government, which got into office on a free-trade policy, should actually support protection of the agricultural interest.

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland) said he wished to move to reduce Item H by £100 in regard to Kew Gardens.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member would have to move the reduction of the whole Vote by £200 or £500. He had already put a reduction on the whole vote of £100 which had been negatived, and a reduction on an item would not now be in order.

MR. SUMMERBELL said that in that case he would move to reduce the Vote by £500, in order to call attention to the position of the gardeners at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, and to the appointment of an assistant director there at a salary of something like £500. There were, he said, about twenty-four officials at the gardens already, and he would like the hon. Baronet who represented the Board of Agriculture to explain why it was necessary to make this further appointment. He complained that the gardeners, who did highly-skilled work, received only 21s. a week wages, as compared with the 24s. given to the labourers and the 27s. received by the gardeners in the Royal parks. These men had a legitimate claim to some consideration. He begged to move.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That a sum not exceeding £77,340, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Summerbell.*)

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford) hoped the hon. Baronet would see his way to entertain the appeal which had been made to him on behalf of the gardeners at Kew. At the present time they were receiving only 21s. per week although they were skilled scientific workmen, whilst the labourers at Kew were receiving 24s. per week. In the Royal Parks the gardeners received 27s. per week, and the London County Council paid their gardeners 27s., rising to 30s. per week. He thought it was very discreditable for the Government to lag behind the London County Council in the matter of wages. Although there was now a Moderate majority on the London County Council they had not heard that there was any intention of reducing the wages of the workmen. The gardeners at Kew were not getting even rough justice, and the moral effect of that must be even more serious because such long hours and poor pay were demoralising. The present scale of payment was entirely indefensible. They had heard a good deal about sweated industries, and he was inclined to think that those gardeners came under that heading. He hoped that every suspicion of sweating would be removed from the department, and that the Government would take up their proper position as model employers of labour.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said a great deal of clerical work had to be done at Kew, and at present the director had to give almost the whole of his time to that clerical work and had little time left for the scientific research work which was expected of him. It was not fair to expect a man who had supreme control of that scientific work to give many hours daily to routine work. An assistant ought to be appointed. The sum had been voted before, but the post had not been filled up. He hoped the wages of the gardeners would be increased. Even if it were admitted that they went to Kew for the purpose of getting further training, a wage of 21s. was too low. Rents in the neighbourhood of Kew were rather high, and the men could not get a house or rooms unless they paid a high rate. Under those circumstances it was not possible for a man to maintain himself in comfort upon such a low rate of wages as 21s. per week. He would like to know the opinion of the director himself upon that point. He thought hon. Members who had spoken on the subject were quite justified in calling attention to the question. If the gardeners' wages were increased the wages of the sub-foremen ought also to be increased.

MR. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness) did not think these gardeners could live decently upon 21s. a week. It was a very strange thing that whilst the labourers at Kew were receiving 24s. a week the gardeners were paid only 21s. He thought a good case had been made out for increasing their wages. The present scale of payment debarred these men from even considering the possibility of married life. That was a point which was worth considering by the hon. Baronet. He thought the best course to pursue would be to give the gardeners a small advance this year, and continue it each year, so that the men would be gradually placed upon the same level as the labourers employed at Kew.

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The present director of Kew Gardens is overworked, and, in the interests of scientific research, it is absolutely necessary that he should have an assistant. I am sure that my hon. friend who raised this question does not desire that exceptionally long hours of labour should be imposed upon any man. My hon. friend believes in short hours of labour, but I can assure him that the director at Kew works a great deal more than eight hours a day. It is, therefore, absolutely necessary that he should have some assistance, and the appointment of an assistant director is necessary. It is on that ground alone that the appointment of this assistant is asked for, and it is in the public interest that this recommendation is made. The Treasury have sanctioned it, and before doing so they satisfied themselves that the appointment was absolutely necessary. With regard to the gardeners employed at Kew, it is a question to be considered entirely by itself. "Gardeners" is a wrong name to give them, because they are not gardeners in the ordinary sense. They are really apprentices learning their work, and fitting themselves for good and remunerative employment elsewhere. The position of things is that in 1906 and 1907 the Treasury refused to sanction an increase in their wages. These young gardeners must be unmarried and can only stay for two years at Kew. This 21s. is not really a wage but a subsistence allowance. The most valuable part of their wages is the experience in scientific horticulture which they gain; they receive a course of lectures, theoretical instruction, and a leaving certificate, and this is all paid for at the expense of the country. No less than 160 of the gardeners who have been trained at Kew now hold official and other posts in various parts of the Empire. There is the greatest competition amongst gardeners to come to Kew in order to get the knowledge to be obtained there and also the valuable certificate which is granted to them upon leaving and enables them to get another appointment. The hon. Gentleman below the gangway said that they ought to have some prospects before them. They do not go to Kew without some prospects of promotion and of higher salaries. They go to Kew to fit themselves for work in other parts of the country and other parts of the Empire. They merely receive their salaries as apprentices; the 21s. is subsistence money and allowance for any out of pocket expenses. It is not paid as wages; otherwise the amount would be such as ought not to be paid, being lower than the ordinary day labourer's wage. It is entirely a misapprehension on the part of hon. Members to suppose that the 21s. is paid as a wage, and that those who receive it ought to be put in the same position as those who receive 24s. a week. They have not to look forward to making their living at Kew; they are acquiring that knowledge which will enable them to get places in England or Europe or in various parts of the Empire. These men are learners, and the wage they receive is an increase on what they received some few years ago, my right hon. friend having raised the amount paid to them. It is a subsistence allowance, and, as I have said, there is no reason why it should be changed at the present moment. My hon. friends will agree with me that the Government have been very liberal in their concessions this year to the foremen, gardeners, ordinary labourers and others on the question of wages, and the reason why we refuse an increase in this instance is because the payment is not a wage in the ordinary sense. These men, in fact, are receiving great assistance. Young men go to private establishments for a year or so to acquire knowledge which will be useful to them in the future, and they do so without receiving any wages. Yet the advantages they obtain in that way are not so great as are those gained by the learners at Kew, who go into the world bearing the imprimatur of that great institution and armed with the certificates which are given to them.

MR. SUMMERBELL said he was surprised at the reply of the hon. Gentleman, for so long as men were paid 21s. a week there would always be discontent. They talked of these men being apprentices and learners, but what sort of an industry was that where a man had to serve five years before they would take him as a first class gardener? And to say that his wage, from the age of twenty to twenty-five years should be 21s. a week was to give him far too little. The men had to go to lectures in their own time. They had to work from six o'clock in the morning to six in the evening, and they were not disposed after such a day's work to attend lectures in the evening. It might have been in the past that these men filled appointments; but it was common ground that, after having been the pioneers in these appointments abroad, they had been put aside for others who had done a little book study and been pitch-forked into the positions. The hon. Baronet might rest satisfied that the matter would be raised again and again, year after year, until something was done to improve the position of these men, which was at present a disgrace to the Government.

MR. C. DUNCAN said the hon. Baronet had mentioned that the wage had been raised from 18s. to 21s., and yet he turned round and said that it was not a question of wages at all. It seemed that that entirely knocked the bottom out of the position of the hon. Baronet. When they considered that the men worked from six in the morning to six in the evening, it certainly appeared that 21s. a week was not even a bare subsistence. He knew something of what it was to live in London, and he found it difficult enough to make ends meet on £2 a week. He had no family to keep, and how a man could be expected to keep a wife and family on 21s. a week he did not know. It was a mystery to him, and he was sure that it must be a mystery to the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Vote. The matter was really worth more consideration than had been given to it, and he hoped that this blot on the record of the Government would be wiped out, and that further consideration would be given to the subject.

*MR. CARLILE agreed that these persons to whom reference had been made occupied an exceptional position. It seemed to him that the explanation given was an entirely satisfactory one. The number of the men was small, probably not more that fifty, and the appointments were open to young and enterprising men. If they succeeded in obtaining those positions they had an admirable opportunity of learning the higher parts of a gardener's work. Added to that, they had the privilege of acquiring scientific knowledge as well. The mere fact that there was a large number of persons who were willing to undergo this period of training in the hope of securing more valuable appointments showed, as the hon. Baronet had said, that the 21s. a week was regarded as mere subsistence money, and it was an arrangement which was held in the main to be satisfactory. They were quite young men who received this pay, and if they were thrifty and wise they certainly would not marry before the age of twenty-five. It was certainly unwise to marry before twenty-five, but evidently young men considered that no hardship at all. Not only had they the allowance of 21s., but they had an opportunity of acquiring positions which, but for their training at Kew, would probably never come within their reach at all. Therefore, he hoped that the Committee would not encourage the hon. Baronet to incur extra expenditure for that particular class of persons. He congratulated the Government on one or two items of expenditure, among them the increased outlay on experimental research. He was sure that money spent in that way was usefully employed. The grants to colleges and to institutions had been increased to £750, but he believed that if that expenditure had been £7,500 instead of £750 it would have been approved by the Committee. Money spent in that way was well invested and would redound to the advantage of agriculturists as well as to the welfare of the country. . Such institutions as that of Rothamstead, in Hertfordshire, should be encouraged by a larger grant, and he trusted that that and other institutions which were doing a great work in the way of research would meet with adequate acknowledgment from the President of the Board of Agriculture. He noticed that the cost in connection with swine fever had gone up by £3,000. Last year it was £38,000, and this year it was £41,000. While he deplored the outbreak of swine fever in Somersetshire, he could not think that that outbreak could be held responsible for the whole of that increase. He would be glad if the hon. Baronet could give him some information about that increase of £3,000. Might he also ask why the forecast under the head of appropriations in aid had been reduced from £6,500 to £5,500, the estimated receipts for fees chargeable under the Enclosures, etc., Act? It seemed a very serious loss to contemplate, and he would be glad to know why the hon. Baronet anticipated a smaller income.

*Mr. McCallum (Paisley) said he desired to call attention to Sunday labour in Kew Gardens. He thought some arrangement should be made whereby some of those employed by the Government should not be kept away from their families every Sunday. Under the present arrangement they scarcely ever had a Sunday at home.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 21; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 172.)

AYES.

Barnes, G. N.
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowerman, C. W.
Bull, Sir William James
Byles, William Pollard
Cave, George
Cooper, G. J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Glover, Thomas
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Jenkins, J.
M'Callum, John M.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Thorne, William
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Watt, Henry A.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Summerbell and Dr. Rutherford.

NOES.

Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brodie, H. C.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherrry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Clough, William
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Everett, R. Lacey
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hart-Davies, T.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Higham, John Sharp
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Jackson, R. S.
Jones, William (C'rnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hn. David
Lough, Thomas
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Morpeth, Viscount
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rees, J. D.
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Thompson, J W. H. (Somerset, E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col W. H. (Lancashire)
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Class III.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £407,605, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the expenses of the prisons in England, Wales, and the Colonies."

Mr. Pickersgill (Bethnal Green) said there was more than one class of persons who had been committed to prison who were not usually found there. These casual occupants of prison cells had often been the means of bringing about valuable reforms in the discipline and management of prisons, because they had frequently called attention to a large number of points in prison life which the outsider might think unimportant and trivial, but which after all were of the greatest value. He did not propose to deal with them in detail, but he desired to refer to two features of prison life with which these unusual prisoners had been specially impressed. The first was what they described as the terrible loneliness of prison life. For hours and hours the prisoner had not a soul to speak to. He would probably be told that there was the chapel, the visit of the chaplain and special visitors, and the visit of the schoolmaster, but the fact remained that the prisoner was left alone for a large number of hours. The more light and air, and the more work in the open air they could give to the prisoners, or the bulk of them, the better it would be for everybody concerned. He would have thought that everybody would have said that solitary confinement was peculiarly mischievous in the case of children. Some of the casual occupants of the prison cells had stated that there was in one of the prisons a child fifteen years of age who was constantly crying in her cell and in the chapel. He would have thought that prison was not the place for a child of tender years. At all events, everyone would agree that a child of fifteen years of age was not a proper subject for solitary confinement. The second point which mainly impressed these unusual prisoners was that the treatment in prison was calculated to destroy the self-respect of the prisoners. It would not do to say that the prisoners had lost all self-respect before they entered prison, because every year there were about 83,000 persons who were committed to prison for the first time. But apart altogether from that consideration, the treatment in prison ought not to be such as to crush out of the prisoner the last lingering remains of self-respect. He would be the last person in the world to desire to make prisons comfortable places, but he did want to make them human places. He wanted prison life to be more humanised than it was now. It seemed to him that they ought to do all they could to encourage the better instincts and feelings of the prisoners. He suggested that visitors and letters should be allowed in a more liberal fashion. It would be well to encourage and foster, as far as possible, the ties which united the prisoner to the family and the home. Success in the management and discipline of a prison depended largely, if not entirely, upon the staff. He found with some regret that governors were usually appointed from the class of naval and military officers. He did not think that the qualities which made a good officer were those which were required in the governor of a prison. He would like to see every governor a civilian. On the other hand, it was sometimes said that it was well to have officers as governors of prisons because they were accustomed to control men. In answer to that he would say that as a matter of fact the governors who had been most successful as disciplinarians had been civilians. One very important object which should be aimed at in prison was the reform of the prisoner, so that when he obtained his liberty he would run straight. He did not think that members of the naval and military profession were the most likely to effect that object. The object of military discipline was to teach men to act together, while the object of prison influence was to enable men to act advantageously separately. The lower officers in prisons were perhaps more important than the governors themselves. The warders played the most prominent part in prison life, and it was impossible to exaggerate the power for good or evil which the warders had. This fact was emphasised in the prison memoirs of Mr. Jabez Balfour. Those memoirs were characterised by a fair spirit. There was nothing vindictive about them. It was most important that all that could be done should be done to attract the best class of men and women to the ranks of warders. He thought that the interests of women prisoners were prejudiced by the fact that there was not a member of their sex upon the higher executive of the Prisons Department. The members of the Prisons Committee and the inspectors were all men. That seemed a little unfair and unreasonable when it was remembered that over 50,000 women passed through our prisons every year. The number was increasing, for it was only about 42,000 ten years ago. He thought the women's side of the prison was not so well managed as the men's side. In particular it seemed to him that the prison industries for women were not so well organised as those for men. The only kind of work in which he had seen women employed in prison was washing clothes. They were doing that in a listless way, which contrasted very unfavourably with the manner in which work was done by women in an ordinary laundry. He suggested that there should be a woman on the Committee, and that there should be one woman among the inspectors. When he raised the question on a former occasion he was told by the then Home Secretary that it was not necessary to have women in those positions, because the interests of women were sufficiently protected by the lady visitors. He was glad that the system of having lady visitors had been adopted. But the lady visitors had no right to interfere with the discipline or the management, and, indeed, if they did interfere in any way, they would probably very soon cease to be visitors at all. It was no answer to say that the lady visitors were sufficient for the purpose. Most of the subjects dealt with by the inspectors fell within the domestic sphere and were more within the purview of women than of men. He hoped he would receive a more favourable reply from the present Home Secretary. He appealed to the Committee itself to press for the change which he had suggested. The House was largely composed of hon. Members who were pledged to maintain the interests of women; they had not yet had an opportunity of redeeming their pledges in the political field, but they had an opportunity now, in a sphere not less important perhaps, of carrying out the spirit of the undertakings they had given by supporting the reasonable suggestion he had made in the interest of the nation at large and of women in particular. He begged to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £407,505, be granted for the said service."—(*Mr. Pickersgill.*).

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington) said he wished to call attention to the treatment of first offenders. He understood that at the present time there were regulations as to the classification of prisoners immediately on their entering prisons, but they were not in every case complied with. He suggested some rearrangement in the administration of the law. At the present time prisoners were being manufactured at an enormous rate, because they were herded together with old offenders in the same cells, met them in the exercise ground, in railway carriages, and in prison infirmaries. He asked the Home Secretary whether he could not find some means by which the committal paper which the police sergeant brought with the prisoner might be altered. If "first offender" was printed on the committal paper in cases where the police were absolutely certain the prisoner had not been in prison before, it might be the means of enabling the governor to know that the man was a first offender. In many cases the governor had to wait a considerable time before he found out whether a prisoner was a first offender or not. He also asked the Home Secretary to take into consideration the Report of the Vagrancy Committee in regard to short sentences, and to consider whether it would not be possible in future to send certain prisoners to labour colonies instead of to prison. If that were done he believed it would do a great deal to prevent first offenders from offending again.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) desired to make an appeal to the Home Secretary as to the amount and quality of the food given to prisoners. Could the right hon. Gentleman assure him that no prisoner who was sentenced to a term of eighteen months or two years imprisonment with hard labour suffered from physical deterioration on discharge on account of the short supply of food? Was it not possible that punishment could be given in other ways than through the stomach? He contended that no man who had been sent to prison for any offence should on leaving prison be found to be a degenerate from want of food. From inquiries he had made he discovered that the scale of food given to prisoners sentenced to comparatively short terms of hard labour was less than that given to prisoners in South Africa. He himself had come across many men who under such circumstances had been quite unable to do any work for a month or two after discharge. As a visiting justice his experience from what he had seen and heard was that eighteen months or two years imprisonment with hard labour was a much harder sentence than five years penal servitude. Another point was as to the employment of women inspectors of womens' prisons. Why should women prisoners not have one of their own sex to look after them? He hoped that on these points the Home Secretary would be able to give a sympathetic reply. Another point was as to the character of the class of warders employed in prisons. Any one who had gone round the prisons of late would admit that the present class of warders were not as humane as they used to be. They had deteriorated and become brutalised. There was, in his opinion, a lack of sufficient kindness on their part to prisoners. He believed that that was due to the fact that the warders were now largely recruited from the military and naval services. They ought to be recruited from the ranks of civilians.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The question raised by my hon. friend who has just sat down has formed the subject of different inquiries at various periods, and was thoroughly investigated by a special Committee appointed two years ago. I am not prepared to say at this moment, and I do not suppose that the Prison Commissioners themselves would say, that, as a matter of fact, the present prison system is the best that could be devised. Everything is capable of improvement, and I can assure the hon. Member that all matters connected with prisons and their management are being carefully watched by the Board, and suggested improvements are welcomed and carefully considered. The hon. Gentleman asked a question as to whether the want of food and its quality given to prisoners sentenced to hard labour had caused actual physical deterioration; and whether prisoners left prison at the expiry of their sentence in a weak condition. So far as my information and experience goes, I can only say that that is not the case. Considerable improvements have been made in the dietary. Statistics show that 60 per cent. of the prisoners actually gained weight when serving their sentence, and only 30 per cent. lost weight. In regard to that 30 per cent. I need not remind hon. Members that a good many prisoners lose weight with great advantage to themselves, and because they have lost weight it does not follow that they have deteriorated physically, or sustained permanent injury to health. I might say that if a good many of the hon. Members of the House were to lose weight within the next six weeks it would do them a great deal of good. The death rate of prisoners from natural causes is only ·37 per 1,000, which is the lowest on record. and, therefore, is extremely satisfactory Of the 252,795 prisoners who passed through local prisons in 1905–6, only 8,241 were admitted to the hospital, and 17,246 were treated in their cells for periods of seven days and over. That came to thirty per 1,000. It must be remembered that a great many of these prisoners go to prison in a weak condition of health. The average weight and average height of a prisoner are very much less than those of the average man outside, so that the material inside is not so good as the material outside, but in spite of that I think the figures that I have given conclusively show that while we may arrive at some further improvement there is nothing radically wrong in our prison treatment at the present time so far as we can discern. My hon. friend the Member for Bethnal Green raised in his speech a large number of questions, which I think he will agree with me are of very great importance and difficulty—too much so to be dealt with in the course of one speech. I always find it difficult to deal with these prison matters, because the more you go into them the more you find the necessity of further consideration. At the present time we have a system which has grown out of the past and is handicapped by many disadvantages. If we were able to pull down all our prisons and build them afresh, at immense cost, no doubt we should be able to effect a great improvement in the treatment of the prisoners. I agree that it is important to give them light and air, and improvements are continually being made in that respect. As to the loneliness of prisoners, there is a special class, those in the first division, who must necessarily be more lonely than the other prisoners, because that can only be avoided by bringing them into association with criminals. I agree that wherever we can get reasonable, rational association which we can be sure will improve the condition of the prisoners, it is, within reasonable limits, desirable. But we must, of course, not lose sight of the penal side of imprisonment. Still, the ideal of every prison reformer is to raise the prisoner rather than to punish him. Association has been largely encouraged during recent years, and whether it can be encouraged more without considerable danger I am not quite sure. I agree with the principles of my hon. friend who has addressed himself to this topic; and if I can do anything to improve matters I shall be glad to do so. It is most undesirable to send children to prison, but it is a constant puzzle to know what to do with them. I hope a remedy will be found in the Probation Bill, which has been read a second time and referred to a Committee. The view that governors should be civilians rather than military or naval men is one which I formerly shared; but after hearing numerous witnesses at an inquiry which was held some fourteen years ago, I came to the conclusion that we can get men as suitable from the Army or Navy as we can from the ranks of civil life. Experience shows, on the whole, that one class is as successful as the other. The greatest care is taken to select men with qualifications fitting them for the position. I do not agree that the warders are, as a class, unsatisfactory. It is, of course, essential that they should be carefully selected, because they need to have good temper, patience, and diligence in their work of dealing with those in their charge; but I cannot agree with my hon. friend that the present staff of warders is unsatisfactory, although there may be unsatisfactory men among them. You always find that. My hon. friend quoted the opinion of Mr. Jabez Balfour; but he praised the general humanity of the warders and the general good temper and kindness with which they discharge their duties, and said that if the existing system could have succeeded they would have made it a success. As to the question of appointing women to superior positions, I am not in favour of making a woman Prison Commissioner. I think there is great force in the contention that we should not be content with the present system of women visitors, excellent as that system is. I recognise that in a prison with a population of 700 women of a most difficult character to deal with the responsibility is a heavy one. I think the time has come when there ought to be some woman in a higher position of authority than that of chief matron, in order that special regard may be paid to the needs of the women. Another way of meeting the difficulty is to appoint women inspectors. I cannot commit myself in this matter, but I shall be glad if I can get the assent of the Treasury to my view. In my opinion the time has come when there ought to be a woman inspector. It is quite true that there are only two prisons which are wholly given over to women; but at the same time there are a large number of other prisons in which women are received. The hon. Gentleman opposite raised the question of the treatment of first offenders. I would remind him that under the present system every care is taken to separate first offenders from habitual offenders. Elaborate provision is made for this purpose in the Prison Rules. In a paragraph of their Report this year the Commissioners say—

> "The complete separation of first offenders from the habitual criminals, which commenced in 1897–98 by the establishment of the star class system in all local prisons, has been continued during the past year. In the nine years in which the system has been in operation, 54,173 males and 10,108 females have been placed in the class, of whom 4,507 males, or 8·3 per cent.; and 1,403 females, or 13·9 per cent., have been re-committed to prison under fresh sentences. Since the formation of the star class in convict prisons in 1879 up to the 31st March last 3,479 male convicts have been placed in it, of whom only 43, or 1·57 per cent. of those discharged, have returned to penal servitude under fresh sentences, and only 33, or 1·2 per cent., have had their licences revoked or forfeited. Of 155 females only one has returned to penal servitude."

I believe that I can give the assurance to the hon. Gentleman that everybody concerned is most anxious to maintain all the ground that has been gained in respect of this question, and, as far as possible, to improve it. All are agreed that it is most undesirable to bring young persons, especially those who are in prison for the first time, into contact with old offenders. I can give the definite assurance that the most constant and vigilant attention is paid to securing that those people shall be, as far as possible, kept apart, and that nothing will be wanting on my part to make any improvement that can be made. There are difficulties in country districts, where you have not the same power of organising separation; but I think I can assure the hon. Member that he need be under no apprehension that that very important matter will be neglected. The hon. Gentleman spoke in rather general terms; but if he will give me specific cases I will have them inquired into.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I will do so. I would rather do it privately than in this House.

*MR. GLADSTONE: I can quite understand that. If he will let me know the cases they will be inquired into. The hon. Member asked a question about the Vagrancy Committee's Report. It is a most interesting and valuable Report, and I have been anxious to find time, along with my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board, to deal with it. It is a subject which has interested me, and I hope that in many respects the important recommendations of the Committee will be adopted. I am living in hope that we may be able to give consideration to the subject before long. I can only say, as bearing on the subject, that we are endeavouring to meet the case, if not directly, at least by legislation which indirectly touches the matter. We have on the stocks a Bill for applying the reformatory system to our prison system in the case of young offenders above the age of sixteen. There has always been a difficulty in regard to young persons of that age. A great deal has been done under the Borstal system, but there has been a great hiatus in our prison system. There is a strong recommendation in favour of the establishment of State reformatories, and now we are preparing a Bill to establish that principle. The age will be sixteen to twenty-three. It is known that the worst criminals are made criminals at the period of their lives. Anyhow, it is when they are adolescent that they seem to drop into habits which lead them to live a life of crime, and I think the Borstal system is an efficient means of getting hold of those young persons. I hope that by including in our prison system reformatories where the conditions will differ from the penal conditions at present in force, and by bringing influences to bear on young offenders while they are fresh, we may redeem them from criminal habits, whether manifested in the shape of the more formidable kinds of crime or in the degeneration of the offenders into vagrants, who were the main subject of inquiry by the Committee to which the hon. Gentleman has alluded.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said he was glad to hear what the right hon. Gentleman had stated on the question of the appointment of governors. The experience of men chosen from naval and military ranks fitted them for the duties they had to perform in controlling the men who came under their charge. He was interested to hear from the right hon. Gentleman that he proposed to appoint a female inspector to look after the female prisoners. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman in any steps he took in that direction to be careful not in any way to discourage the women visitors who were now doing such noble work, not only while the offenders were in prison, but by assisting them after they were liberated. No reflection should be cast on the ladies who had been engaged in that work. He had himself inquired into the food question, and he did not think that any fault could be found with what was done for prisoners in that respect. He was quite sure that in many cases they were better fed in prison than were the class outside from which they came. The food was admirable in quality, and in quantity it was ample to meet the requirements of prisoners. The Report of the Commission on Prisons had not been presented to the House this year, and it was most inconvenient to discuss the Vote without it. He wished to know whether the decline in the number of prisoners still continued, and whether they might hope that the number of criminals, which sharply increased some years ago, would steadily diminish. He would only echo what the right hon. Gentleman had said about the reformatory system for the treatment of juvenile offenders. It would be interesting to know how far the right hon. Gentleman might be able to extend the system to prisoners outside the age limit which he had mentioned. The reformatory system under which young offenders were taught trades which fitted them for civilian life had been of the greatest advantage in reducing the number of habitual criminals, and he would be glad to see the system extended as widely as possible. He believed that at one time there was an intention to introduce the Borstal system irrespective of the length of sentence. He was not sure but that the system had been tried during certain portions of sentences. He thought it might be desirable to remove the limitation. No one acquainted with the subject of prison discipline and management could complain of the quality of the warders or of the admirable way in which they performed their work. He thought a great deal more might be done to make their life tolerable. Any expense incurred in providing recreation rooms for the warders would be money well expended. He thought it was most desirable that warders should have their dwellings within the precincts of the prison instead of having to go long distances. He believed that about many of our prisons there were vacant lands on which suitable dwellings could be built in which the warders could live in decency and comfort with their families. The interest on the outlay for such buildings would not be more than the amount of the allowances which were now made to enable the warders to go long distances to their homes. He asked the right hon. Gentleman in subsequent Estimates to take into view the desirability of housing the warders in buildings which were the property of the Government. He did not desire to delay the Vote, but he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would take into consideration the several points which he had raised.

*Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) said he must also express thanks to the right hon. Gentleman for his statement, and he believed that a good deal of what he had said would give satisfaction to those interested in prison reform. They were especially glad to know that he looked with favour on the appointment of women to superintend women's wards in prisons and in hospitals entirely occupied by female prisoners. He was sorry that the right hon. Gentleman had not gone a step further and agreed to the suggestion of his hon. friend to appoint one woman Commissioner. He thought there were women who were competent to bring different ideas from those perhaps entertained by the male Commissioners, and they might be able to suggest means by which the treatment of women in our prisons would be greatly ameliorated. What seemed to him by far the most important point which they had heard that night was that relating to the extension of the reformatory principle in our prisons. In his judgment all prisons should be reformatories. He did not see why they should stop at the age of twenty-three; he would treat every prisoner as a potential citizen; he would give him some work to do of which he would be able to see the value, and he would keep him associated with other people. On that point he was disappointed at what the right hon. Gentleman had said. The Home Secretary had said that he did not think that association could be carried much further, and the inference was that the solitary system must be maintained. He was certain that the solitary system had a most demoralising effect upon the prisoners. Prince Kropatkin, a great authority with regard to prisons in other countries, went so far as to say that the demoralising effects of prisons were such that a man was worse when he came out of prison than when he went in. He said it was only because people were in ignorance of the realities of the case that they were so absolutely foolish as to maintain at their own expense institutions which turned out men worse than when they went in, and he added that almost in all cases, by proper reforms, they would be able to improve the character of prisoners and turn them out useful citizens. He was aware, however, that he could not discuss that question on this Vote, though a great deal might be said on it. We had no business to do anything with a prisoner except curtail his liberty for our own protection, and then we should do all we possibly could to reform him and make a better man of him when he came out of prison than he was when he went in. What was the meaning of men going back to prison time after time? It was something appalling. Prison at present was a hardening institution. He hoped that the Home Office and the Government would take a wide and humane view of the whole question and try to alter our present system in a very radical manner. The right hon. Gentleman himself had said that no doubt the present system was not the best possible, but that it had grown out of the past and so on. Let them get rid of the past idea of punishing vindictively and revengefully those people who had offended against society. The conditions under which many had to live brought them into contact with the criminal classes, and they were often driven into crime. It should be remembered that when they got men into prison it was not merely to hold them there as long as they could, but that they ought to pursue the work of reforming the criminal. He hoped that his hon. friend would not press his Amendment to a division, though he trusted that the promise of the right hon. Gentleman of a Bill to extend the reformatory principles in connection with our prisons would be fulfilled, and that the measure would be introduced shortly and receive strong support.

MR. PICKERSGILL asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

3. £127,105, to complete the sum for Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain.

4. £24,128, to complete the sum for Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum.

Resolutions [16th May] and Resolutions of this day to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

*Mr. Byles.*

---

## SUPPLY [2ND MAY].

Resolutions reported.

## CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

### CLASS III.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £36,985, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioner of Police, the Police Courts, and the Metropolitan Police Establishment of Dublin."

### CLASS II.

2. "That a sum, not exceeding £24,568, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £46,411, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland."

Resolutions agreed to.

---

## ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to

Adjourned accordingly at half after Eight o'Clock.

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Friday, 24th May,* 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [Lords] (by Order); read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill; read a second time, and committed.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Dublin, Portrush, and Fermoy, presented by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3). Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the rural districts of Rathdown (No. 1), Monaghan, Balrothery, and Belfast, presented by Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill and Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. Ordered, That, in the case of the Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill and of the Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill, Standing Order 193A be suspended, and the Bills be read the first time.—(*The Chairman of Ways and Means.*)

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to Dublin, Portrush, and Fermoy," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 209.]

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the rural districts of Rathdown (No. 1), Monaghan, Balrothery, and Belfast," read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 210.]

## *PETITIONS.*

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Ferry Port-on-Craig; Latheron; and, Rathven; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition of the county council of the West Riding of Yorkshire, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL.

Petition from Ayr, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Fearn; and, London; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Chale, against; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Colchester, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

### PROBATION OF OFFENDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Petition from Ayr, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Ayr, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### ULLAPOOL FREE CHURCH.

Petition from Ullapool, for further inquiry; to lie upon the Table.

### WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.

Petition from London, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### TRADE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND BRITISH POSSESSIONS).

Copy presented, of annual statement of the trade of the United Kingdom with foreign countries and British

Possessions for 1906. Volume II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### ENDOWED CHARITIES (ELEMENTARY EDUCATION) (CORNWALL).

Copy presented, of Report made to the Board of Education in the result of an inquiry into endowments subject to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894, and appropriated in whole or in part to purposes of elementary education in the county of Cornwall or in any part thereof [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Return of advances made under The Irish Land Act, 1903, during the months of July and October, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### CROFTERS HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) ACTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered, 14th May; *Mr. Sinclair*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 162.]

### LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Copy presented, of Returns relating to the Council up to 31st March, 1907, with Estimate of Expenditure for the year ending 31st March, 1908 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 163.]

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3,800 to 3,803 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

---

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

---

### Taximeter Cabs.

MR. GODDARD CLARKE (Camberwell, Peckham): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the statutory rules and orders of 1907 (No. 199), made under The Metropolitan Public Carriage Act, 1869, providing that no distance recorder or taximetre shall be affixed to any hackney carriage without the seal or mark approved by the Commissioner affixed thereto, and that if a recorder or taximetre not having such seal or mark intact be affixed to any hackney carriage the licence of that carriage shall be liable to revocation or suspension, and of the fact that the learned magistrate at Bow Street on the 14th instant declined to enforce the scales of fares made in accordance with the above rules as applied to motor hackney carriages, on the ground that the taximetre affixed to the carriage, the driver of which was being then prosecuted for charging an excessive fare, had no such seal or mark as the rule requires, he will say whether there are any other motor hackney carriages plying on the streets of London for hire having taximetres affixed thereto, and which are unprovided with said seal or mark; and, if so, will their licences be revoked or suspended until such time as the said rules are complied with.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) None of the taximeter motor cabs, about 140 in number, which are now plying in the streets of London, have yet had their taximeters sealed as prescribed in the new Public Carriage Order. The cause of the delay has been the necessity for careful inquiry and experiment in order to decide what tests taximeters should be subjected to before sealing. This question is now, I hope, on the point of being settled. In the meantime the cabs already equipped could only have been prevented from running at great loss to their owners and some inconvenience to the public, and, while steps are being taken to ensure full compliance with the order at an early date, the Commissioner of Police does not contemplate taking such action as is suggested in the Question.

### Cocoa Duties.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been drawn to the statement by a large chocolate manufacturer that the absence of a cocoa drawback on exported chocolates considerably impedes the expansion of the export trade in these goods; and whether he will take steps in Committee on the Finance Bill to make such alterations in the Revenue Laws as will remove this hardship from the chocolate industry.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) Yes, Sir. But, as I explained in reply to a Question by the hon. Member for North West Lanarkshire on the 29th ultimo, there are other anomalies in connection with the present scale of cocoa duties which make it undesirable to deal with the question of drawback except as part of a general scheme of revision, which I am not prepared to propose in connection with the Finance Bill of this year.

### Hartley Wintney School.

SIR A. SPICER (Hackney, Central): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, notwithstanding the repeated outbreaks of infectious disease at the Hartley Wintney districts schools, the adverse Report of His Majesty's inspector in 1905 regarding the children's education and attainments, the desire of a number of the guardians of the unions forming the school district to adopt other ways of dealing with the children, and the pledge given by the Department after the issue of the Report of the Department Committee of 1896 that barrack schools should not be enlarged, official encouragement is being given to the spending of a large sum of money on enlarging the present school buildings.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The accommodation at the school is not sufficient to provide for the children of the unions comprised in it. The Local Government Board's inspector for the district discussed the matter with the managers in February last. He pointed out various ways in which the difficulty might be met, and expressed his personal opinion that an enlargement of the school would probably be found the best and, in the long run, the most economical course. Even if the accommodation was extended as suggested the institution would not be a large one, and would not appear to come within the category of a barrack school to which exception has been taken. The school is in an open and healthy situation, and His Majesty's inspector of schools has reported last year that the instruction had improved since his last visit and that it promised well.

### Imports from Germany.

MR. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what was the value of the consignments from Germany to the United Kingdom of food, drink and tobacco, raw materials, and manufactures, respectively, in 1904 and 1905.

MR. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the value of the exports to Germany from the United Kingdom of food, drink and tobacco, raw materials, and manufactures, respectively, in 1904 and 1905.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The following statement gives the information desired so far as shown in the United Kingdom Trade Accounts:—

| | Imports into the United Kingdom consigned from Germany. | | Exports of the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom to Germany. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1904. | 1905. | 1904. | 1905. |
| | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| Food, drink, and tobacco - | 11,030,000 | 11,230,000 | 2,080,000 | 2,946,000 |
| Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured - | 3,547,000 | 3,896,000 | 3,893,000 | 4,458,000 |
| Articles wholly or mainly manufactured - - | 34,318,000 | 38,057,000 | 18,585,000 | 21,635,000 |
| Miscellaneous and unclassified (including parcel post) - - - - | 617,000 | 656,000 | 543,000 | 663,000 |
| Total - - | 49,512,000 | 53,839,000 | 25,101,000 | 29,702,000 |

### Revenue Penalties of over £50.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will give instructions that full particulars be given to the Annual Reports of the two Revenue Boards of any penalties of £50 and upwards inflicted on the sureties for Revenue bonded premises as a result of irregularities.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) There is no record for many years past of the infliction of any such penalty by either of the Revenue Boards; but, in any case, I do not think it would be advisable to publish details of cases of this nature in the Annual Reports unless there should happen to be in any case some feature of public importance.

### War Office Pensions—Case of Hugh Craig.

MR. W. BENN (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the statement of Hugh Craig that he is not in a fit condition to undergo an anæsthetic, as required by the War Office before granting a continuation of his pension; will he say whether the pension will be granted if Craig produces a medical certificate to this effect; and what provision would be made for those dependent on him should he succumb under the operation.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) An anæsthetic would not be administered unless it was considered safe by the medical authorities. The latter will be glad to receive any evidence that Craig is unfit to receive a general anæsthetic, but the ultimate decision as to whether he is or is not fit must rest with them. In the event of death under an anæsthetic I regret to say that the man's dependents would have no claim to compensation.

---

## EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN BILL [LORDS.]

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday next, and to be printed. [Bill 211.]

## SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) [SALARIES.]

Considered in Committee.

[MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, for carrying out the provisions of any Act of the present session to encourage the formation of Small Agricultural Holdings in Scotland, it is expedient to authorise—(i.) the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, of the salaries of the chairman, and of each of the other members of the Land Court; (ii.) the payment out of moneys provided by Parliament of—(a) the salaries and remuneration of the Agricultural Commissioners and other persons appointed or employed by them, and by the Land Court, and the expenses incurred by the Land Court and the Agricultural Commissioners in the execution of their duties; (b) an annual sum not exceeding eighty-five thousand pounds for the use of the Agricultural Commissioners; (c) compensation in certain cases to members and officers of the Crofters' Commission."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said that the general expenditure under this Bill ought to be reviewed as a whole. The Land Court, the Agricultural Commission, and the Board of Agriculture for Scotland were practically part of one organisation, and therefore it was necessary to take the whole subject of expenditure under review. After all, the Agricultural Commissioner was to act as the State Ground Officer in the scheme of expenditure on small holdings; he took the work in its first stage, and the Land Court would take it in its second stage, and then would come in the new Board of Agriculture. All these were, as he had said, very closely connected, and one organisation; and he could not see how they could deal with the question of finance without reviewing all the authorities set up by the Bill—the Land Court, the Agricultural Commission, and the Board of Agriculture. The work which those bodies were to undertake was to regulate the tenure of land in Scotland. Money would be required for all their operations. There would be the work of carving out the farms into small holdings, and the creation and equipment of small holdings. The Land Court would also have to deal with the whole question of intensive cultivation, in regard to which no provision was made for enlisting the assistance of the local authorities, and therefore that would have to be paid work. Then there was the question of making provision for sylviculture out of the grants; of promoting the efficiency of small cultivation and of agriculture generally. The cost involved was like the methods of the Bill — somewhat hazy, and he thought that the different items of expenditure ought to be more completely defined at the present stage. If not now, he did not know when. The system of finance was defended as being the cheapest way of dealing with the question. But they should look at the facts before they could say that it would be the cheapest. Clause 3 of the Bill which set up the Land Court was not in the Bill of last year, and they ought to be told why that clause had been found to be necessary. There was an item of £6,000 for salaries of the members of the Land Court; but they ought to know why that new provision had been found necessary. A Land Court had not been found necessary under the Crofters Act, and he did not know why it was necessary here. The Land Court would not be recognised as a judicial authority, because the State being the managing director in the co-partnership, the Land Court would be regarded more in the light of an agency than of a judicial body. The expense of the Crofters Commission had been very considerable, and the work of the Land Court would be very much greater than that of the Crofters Commission. Under the Bill leaseholders were added, and the Crofters Acts were extended to all holdings below £50 rent or under 50 acres—which might mean holdings up to £500 rent, and on pastoral farms in the West Highlands up to 1,000 acres. The expenditure, therefore, might be very much greater than the £6,000 here provided. The Court would have to superintend and authorise the gifts and the loans that were to be made for equipment. It would have to conduct valuations for the incoming and outgoing tenants, which would be very numerous among a mobile population. They were no longer dealing with a residential but with an industrial population, and the whole of the valuations would be much more complicated. They would have to value individual holdings instead of townships, and the litigation that would ensue would be enormous. Valuations would have to be made of the existing equipments. Calculations would have to be made as to whether the loss would not be too great to incur. The new equipment would have to be set up by aid of the State, and that equipment would have to be supervised, or there would be an immense waste of public money. In fact, when, in an industrial district, a man went out of his holding, there would be the most intricate basis of valuation that could possibly be imagined, especially when free sale was excluded. The Lord Advocate had admitted that in some parts of Scotland litigation was carried on with the greatest vehemence. He had heard of two litigants who were disputing as to whether a march fence should have two or six wires on it. The case was carried from the Sheriff Court to the Outer House of the Court of Session, thence to the Inner House, and eventually to the House of Lords. As a matter of fact the litigants were the proprietors of only 130 acres each. He thought it would be wholly unwise to assume that the litigation would be comparable with that under the Crofters Acts. It was assumed that a great number of tenants would be able to agree with the landowner and would not come before the Land Court at all. But the rating immunity under the Bill would force the small holders before the Land Court. That was the only way to get relief for the rating of their fixtures. That rating was a very serious item. The reduction of 3d. of the income-tax was a flea-bite compared with the 5s. involved in local rates. If a man could build a house in Lewis or Sutherlandshire for £400 or £500 and escape rating on it, the inducement to escape from the incidence of that rating would be sufficiently great to force every tenant to go before the Court. Perhaps that point could be cleared up under the valuation proposals of the Government. The work also of initiating small holdings must necessarily come before the Court. It would be for the Court to take the initiative. The local authorities would not do it; and the owners could not do it. It was said that ownership was not touched by the Bill; but his contention was that the Bill destroyed ownership. The Court must, therefore, find their way out, or they would be making ropes out of sand. He did not think that the cost of the Court would be less than three times the salaries; or, say £20,000 a year. Regarding the Agricultural Commissioner, he had to direct the whole land policy of the Government; to conduct inquiries throughout Scotland as to the requirements of the districts for small holdings, and as to the land available; to present his reports to the Land Court; to make plans and new steadings; to devise methods of utilising the old equipment; and to supervise the expenditure. If the small holdings were to be a success they would have to take part in the establishment of land banks and co-operative enterprise, otherwise the small farmer would not be able to compete with the large, nor with the Danish co-operator, in which case he would be an economic failure. He would have no financial difficulty in regard to the extension of intensive cultivation, but he would have the entire arrangements to make for it. He would have the supervision of the expenditure of £65,000 a year, and that meant something like £3,000 a year, taking the average cost of management at 4½ per cent. The Agricultural Commissioner himself could not possibly superintend the management of all the scattered holdings and the scattered investments throughout the country. He would have to have deputies in the different localities; and while there would be a large central office in Edinburgh, there would have to be local offices for the State factors. Private factoring in Scotland cost about £250,000 a year, and the whole of that factoring would conflict with that of the State. He could not think, therefore, that the cost of this Department would be less than £20,000 a year. His next point was the cost of the new Board of Agriculture. The cost of the Irish Board was £190,000, and he thought they ought to be told what the cost of the Scottish Board was to be. The Secretary for Scotland said they ought to have £200,000 a year.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): No; what I said was that if we spent money upon agriculture in Scotland at the rate they did in other countries we should have to spend £200,000 a year.

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said that appeared to be the sum which would be needed if the expenditure was of a satisfactory character. But they ought to be told what they were going to spend. It could not be limited by the salaries of the proposed Commission in Edinburgh, as the existing powers of the Board of Agriculture would have to be transferred to the new body, which would want a staff, laboratories, and the services of experts, so that the experiments might be conducted which were much wanted for small farms and the general working of agriculture. Then the new Board would be entrusted with sylviculture, and many hon. Members had expressed themselves in favour of afforestation being dealt with. He wished to know, however, whether the words which had been uttered upon that subject were mere words or would result in the creation of timber; whether they were simply words in the air, or population on the soil. It was possible to spend £250,000 a year upon afforestation, and unless £25,000 were expended they should achieve no results at all. Then there was the question of the cost of housing all these bodies and of the provision of the laboratories, which with the expenditure upon the central local office, must be very large. He thought it would absorb about £100,000 a year to give the Bill a start. If the objects of the Bill were not developed by the money they voted and that £100,000 was wanting, it would mean the ruin of the Bill. In addition £65,000 for the equipment of small farms was sufficient for the experimental work in regard to them, but would be wholly inadequate to meet the demands of the system established by the Bill. The land system in Scotland, whether it was satisfactory or not, was very highly equipped, and the capital now invested would be diverted, probably to the extent of £1,000,000 a year, by the passing of this Bill. On the average in 1875 it had taken about 20 per cent. to equip land on a rental of £8,000,000 as it then was. Now the rental was far nearer £5,500,000, the equipment more costly, and the occupiers could not meet the deficiency with regard to equipment. They had to take into account the fact that the State might be called upon to make up a large part of that deficiency, or else the agricultural equipment of the country must deteriorate. Then there were one or two contingent liabilities which they would incur by the Bill. There was the security for the owners' rent under the Bill, because he had security for seven years or for the end of a lease. An assurance was given to the owner that there should be no loss under the working of the Bill, and he did not know whether that meant that his rent would not be reduced for a still longer period, but at any rate it would involve liability upon the State of the owners' loss which was to be made good, and he did not think it was provided for.

MR. SINCLAIR, on a point of order, said his hon. friend had arrived now at a question which would have to be discussed on the Committee stage of the Bill, and which had only a remote connection with the finance of the measure. He would, therefore, ask the guidance of the Chairman on the matter. The discussion on the point must be renewed, and if it were continued they would be committing the Committee to a Second Reading discussion of the Bill. He was anxious not to do that and thus involve the House in the inconvenience of a duplicate debate.

*THE CHAIRMAN said he had listened to the speech of the hon. Member very carefully. His argument was that the provisions of the Bill being so and so, the expenditure under the Bill would be likely to be such and such a sum. That argument was in order, but he did not know whether that particular point he was on at the moment was. He did not think it was in order; the hon. Member seemed to be addressing himself to a Committee point.

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said he did not know whether he was in order or not, but surely what he was entitled to point out was that, besides the Resolution they had under discussion, the clauses made it clear that there were certain liabilities which were a necessary consequence of the Bill and which they had to bear in mind in grasping the whole scope of the financial proposals.

*THE CHAIRMAN said if that was the case and the liabilities in question were not included in the financial Resolution, he thought they ought to be dealt with in Committee rather than on that occasion.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) asked what provision would be made for dealing with these contingent liabilities.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that was not a question for him. He had only to deal with this Resolution.

*MR. HAROLD COX was afraid he had not made himself clear; would these contingent liabilities have to come before the House in Committee of Ways and Means, because if there was in the Bill a contingent liability on the State, that should be dealt with in Committee of Ways and Means.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that was a point to be thrashed out in Committee. If there was a further liability upon public funds that would have to be thrashed out in Committee and possibly dealt with in another Money Resolution.

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said he quite understood the ruling of the Chairman and would therefore restrict his remarks to the three points as to the finance of the Land Court, of the Agricultural Commission on Small Holdings, and of the Board of Agriculture. Those were the three points which arose under the clauses, and unless the Treasury grasped them they would get into a financial morass. But he thought in connection with the three points of which he had spoken he had made out strong grounds for asking for some explanation.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) said it would be convenient to the Committee to know exactly what they were voting upon, and he protested against voting on this financial Resolution in the dark. They were dealing with two separate matters. A Land Court was to be established for the first time, with a chairman with a salary of £2,000 a year, and with four other members, each of whom was to receive £1,000 a year, making £6,000 a year in all. They were then asked to vote absolutely in the dark some further expenditure for all the other officials connected with the Court and the expenses which they incurred in the execution of their duty. What he would like to ask was what officials it was intended to create and their number, and what was the total estimated expenditure upon them and upon the Land Court under the Bill. They had not been told that; they were simply writing a blank cheque for the use of the Secretary for Scotland for such expenses as he chose to incur with regard to the Land Court. There was a second point. It seemed perfectly clear that there was to be a totally different body created under the Bill—a Land Commission consisting of three commissioners, one of whom was to be the chairman. In the case of the Land Court they were told the salaries of the chairman and of the four assistant commissioners, but they were not given the same information about the Land Commission. He objected to vote in the dark as to what salaries the commissioners were to receive. What was to be the salary of the chairman?

MR. SINCLAIR said there was no chairman with a salary mentioned in the Bill.

MR. RAWLINSON said that from the language of the second clause an Englishman might well fall into the error of thinking that there was to be a salaried chairman. It was to the effect that it should be lawful to appoint not more than three persons to be designated Agricultural Commissioners for Scotland, one of whom should be chairman. How could the right hon. Gentleman expect he should know that the latter was not to be paid?

*THE CHAIRMAN, interposing, said that that was surely a point for the Committee stage of the Bill.

MR. RAWLINSON said he agreed it was a Committee point, but the right hon. Gentleman interrupted.

MR. SINCLAIR said there was no increased salary due to the appointment of the chairman.

MR. RAWLINSON said he found in the Bill that the Agricultural Commissioners, and such other Commissioners as might be appointed should receive respectively such salary and remuneration as the Treasury might sanction, and that those salaries should be paid out of monies voted by Parliament. He submitted that that question was directly before the Committee. It was provided that there should be three Commissioners, one of whom should be chairman, and then the next section went on to say that the Commissioners should receive remuneration, but the right hon. Gentleman told him across the floor of the House that the chairman was not to receive remuneration. That was the matter which they were there to discuss, viz., the salaries and remuneration of the Commissioners and other persons employed. If it was correct that the chairman of the Commisssioners was to be an unpaid official surely they should know that before they voted on the matter. According to the Bill it appeared to him that there were to be three people who were to be paid salaries. He wished to know what was the estimate of the Government as to cost with regard to not only the Land Court but also the Agricultural Commissioners. Was it an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of pounds or was it not? He was not dealing with the merits of the Bill, but as an English Member he protested against the vague way in which the Financial Resolution was put before the Committee. He had just elicited that some of these people were to be paid and some unpaid officials, and they ought to have complete information in regard to all the cases. Before discussing the matter he wished to know what amount the Government thought was likely to be required on the Vote the Committee was asked to pass.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) said he had no desire to express an opinion on the clauses of the Bill. He simply rose as an English Member to protest against the expenditure, because he thought it was time someone should protest against the way in which the Liberal Party, although pledged to economy, were continually adding to national expenditure. By Clause 3 of the Bill the country was being pledged to an unlimited expenditure. He was in favour, like the rest of the Liberal Party, of a large extension of small holdings, but he was not in favour of taking the taxpayers' money for the purpose of subsidising any particular form of industry. In his own constituency there were many small tradesmen who would like to set up in business, but would they be justified in coming to the House and asking for money to set them up? If once the Government admitted the principle that they might subsidise a particular form of industry, where were they to stop? Were mill owners to be entitled to come and ask for the capital to put machinery into their mills, or mine-owners for money to sink shafts? If once they acceded to the demand to equip small holdings at the taxpayers' expense, they would be met with demands to equip other industries in the same manner, and he did not see where it was to cease. They had no guarantee, moreover, that the small holdings would be occupied by labourers at all. He was informed that the reason that the price of small holdings in Scotland was so high was that instead of their being occupied by labourers, they were taken by the tradesmen of the neighbouring towns who used them as pleasure farms. He contended that the Government had no right to spend the taxpayers' money in subsidising industry; the House was pledged to economy, and hon. Members ought carefully to scrutinise the expenditure of every penny of public money.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said the hon. Member for Preston had raised a very natural protest, but the hon. Member for Leith Burghs had entered much more fully into the administrative difficulties which might be involved, and shown how very blindly they were being asked to vote money so far as the extent of the different items was concerned. The first of the items was the money proposed to be expended on the Land Court, and the hon. Member had very successfully shown that the Land Court would cost £30,000 a year. He himself did not think it could cost less. The next item was that for the Land Commissioners, who would, he presumed, not cost less than £3,000 or £4,000 a year. Both the Land Court and the Land Commissioners were to have large staffs, and if the staffs were to bear the ordinary relation to the chiefs—if there was to be an army which was not composed entirely of officers—the salaries of that staff must bear a much larger proportion to the total than that which was spent on the Land Court and the Land Commissioners. It was impossible to say what the total expenditure, which they were asked to sanction so blindly, would be if they had no estimate. But it could not be less than £30,000 a year. What was the amount of money which that £30,000 a year paid to officials was to administer? It was £65,000, or at the most £80,000, if to that £65,000 was added the £15 000 which had already been added to the congested districts fund. He, however, understood that it was £65,000, and the cost of the administration was to be nearly 50 per cent. of the amount administered. Was that the proper relation that ought to exist between the cost of administration and the sum to be administered? Only the other day when they were discussing the affairs of Ireland they found one item which was thought to be over large, and many Members discussing it thought that 35 per cent. was an unheard of cost for administration. In this case, however, it was nearly 50 per cent. There was no limit to the amount which might have to be spent under the first part of the Resolution, but the limit for recasting the small holdings in Scotland could not be less than £65,000, and at that rate the recasting of the Scottish system of holding land would be very slow. By its very nature the amount of money that would have to be administered by these officials could not be limited. There were certain obligations absolutely beyond the control of the Government which might arise and have to be dealt with. They were told on the occasion of the Second Reading that if there was a loss on these farms it was only fair that it should be borne by the State. How could the State limit such a liability as that? How could they say that such a liability would be confined to £65,000 a year? The Secretary for Scotland shook his head, but he had not vouchsafed to the Committee any information. These points showed that the Committee was justified in insisting upon a full explanation of the financial clauses of the Bill, and in asking for an explanation of the reasons that had led the Government to impose on the country such an enormous burden of officialism, adding to the ranks already too costly another rank which would bear to the amount administered the marvellous proportion of 50 per cent. They were entitled to ask the Government who had proposed that an unlimited liability should rest upon the country whether they were prepared to say that the total sum which they intended to put at the disposal of the Commissioners could in the nature of things ever be confined to £65,000 a year. If they had some explanation perhaps the Committee would find itself in a better position to carry on the discussion.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said the hon. Member for Cambridge had raised a very important point, namely, that the Committee was asked to vote money for the payment of officials without having been given any information as to what that amount was going to be, and he was surprised that the right hon. Gentleman opposite had not given greater consideration to his remarks. The whole consensus of opinion three years ago of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who now occupied the Treasury Bench was against anything of the sort here proposed being done. In June, 1904, when the Financial Resolution of the Aliens Bill was being discussed, the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Islington opened the debate by saying that it would be only reasonable that Resolutions of the kind should appear upon the Paper so that the Committee knew their precise provisions before they were asked to debate them. Why had not that been done in this case? Then came the hon. Member for Halifax, who said that a good deal depended on the quantity of administering they were to do, that being limited by the number to be employed. Then came the President of the Board of Education, who thought the Committee ought to know how many officials the Home Secretary was going to appoint and what sort of men they were to be. Nothing of the sort had been done with regard to this Bill. Then the Postmaster-General made two extraordinary admissions. The right hon. Gentleman first stated that he had voted for the Second Reading, but that he would not have done so had he thought it was to be sent to a Grand Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN said it was quite out of order for the hon. Gentleman to deal in that way with a Bill which was not before the House.

SIR F. BANBURY said the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty also objected to the clause giving power to provide officers and to provide for the salaries of persons to be employed. He thought he had shown that on a precisely similar Resolution hon. and right hon. Gentlemen had not taken the very steps which they had advocated three years ago. He hoped, therefore, they would give some explanation why they had suddenly changed their opinions. With regard to the first Resolution, which said there should be paid £2,000 a year to the President of the Land Court and £1,000 a year to each of the other members, which money was to come out of the Consolidated Fund, he believed he was right in saying the effect of that would be that the acts of those five gentlemen could not be reviewed by the House of Commons, inasmuch as, since the money was to be taken out of the Consolidated Fund, there would be no opportunity of reviewing their acts upon the Estimates. On the Vote for the salary of the Secretary for Scotland there might be an opportunity, but that Vote might not come before the House except under the closure. He therefore objected most strongly to voting money out of the Consolidated Fund in the manner proposed. It was proposed to spend £6,000 a year on the salaries of five gentlemen, who were to administer a system which had been most unsuccessful wherever it had previously been set up—to administer a Land Court for which there was no precedent in either England or Scotland, and over which Parliament might not have any control. The Secretary for Scotland ought to be able to give some idea to the Committee of what sum of money he was going to demand from the Treasury, what number of officials he was going to appoint, and what their duties were to be. The Committee were asked by this Resolution to provide a sum of about £100,000, so far as he could understand; £85,000 was to be money taken from the taxpayers. The hon. Member for the Leith Burghs had shown—and the opinion of the hon. Member ought to weigh very greatly with the Committee—that £100,000 a year would be necessary for the officers of both bodies.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON said that was assuming that sylviculture was adopted.

Sir F. BANBURY said that was what he understood was going to be done. The money would be devoted to the Land Court and the Land Commissioners, and they would do certain work which the Agricultural Commissioners had undertaken in connection with the Board of Agriculture, which was to be separated from the Board of Agriculture in England, and was to become a separate Board. If all those things were to be done the expenditure would be £100,000 a year, because anything less would be false economy, and no economy could be so false as that which set up a Department in such a manner that it had not the funds to work properly. The hon. Member had said £100,000 would be required for that, and that only showed the danger of setting up Boards to do work which ought to be done by the landowners themselves. The hon. Member for Preston had pointed that out, and had made a very strong point when he asked whether the Government intended to set up manufacturers and others in business. How did the right hon. Gentleman know that the money was not going to be wasted; what would happen to the money; and what foundation or grounds had he for thinking that it would serve any useful purpose at all?

*The CHAIRMAN said that was a matter of principle which the House had dealt with on the Second Reading of the Bill, and it was not in order to discuss it on this Resolution.

Sir F. BANBURY asked whether, when they were going to vote away the money of the taxpayers, they might not deal with the question of what was going to happen to the money.

*The CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member was arguing that the Bill would not have a good effect, and that argument was out of order, because the House had passed the Second Reading of the Bill.

Sir F. BANBURY said that all he wished to know was whether the money was going to be wasted, or whether they were not going to enter into a large system of land speculation which might lead to no good result.

*The CHAIRMAN said that that was the exact point which he understood the hon. Baronet was trying to make, and that point was out of order.

Sir F. BANBURY said he bowed to the ruling of the Chair, but, nevertheless, it seemed to him that though the representatives of the taxpayers were asked to vote the money, they were not allowed to argue that it might be wasted. A full discussion should be allowed upon all the expenditure under the Resolution, and that was the only opportunity they would have to discuss it. What was to happen when a loss occurred in connection with these holdings? They were going to vote the sum of £65,000 a year, and that sum was to be devoted to certain objects. Would the amount be sufficient for those objects? The Prime Minister had said that any loss arising out of the Act ought fairly to fall on the State, and all they wanted to know was how it was possible to provide for a loss out of the sum of £65,000. The money was nothing like sufficient if the objects of the Bill were to be carried out in the manner which the right hon. Gentleman desired. If the whole of the £65,000 were directed to those objects it would only enable them to provide something like 130 small holdings annually, and that left wholly out of consideration the enormous expenditure which must arise when these different bodies were set up under the Bill. Under those circumstances, and in view of the fact that they had no opportunity of knowing what money was really going to be spent on the salaries of officials, he felt it his duty to oppose the Resolution.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present. House counted; and, forty Members being present—

*Mr. MORTON (Sutherland) said a great deal had been attempted to be made of the loss which might occur under the Bill, but he did not believe that there would be any loss at all. As far as their experience went of small holdings and allotments there had been no loss. He quite agreed with hon.

Gentlemen opposite that they had a right to ask for particulars with regard to expenditure under the Bill, and if the Secretary for Scotland could give them a rough estimate, they might get on much faster. It was absurd to think that they would be able to carry out the purposes of the Bill without any expenditure at all. They could not expect to have Commissioners and the other machinery of the measure without incurring some cost. His hon. friend the Member for Preston seemed to think that they ought to carry on the proposed Department without coming on the taxpayer at all. If they could do that with all the Departments the Government would get rid of the salaries of officials and probably those of Ministers. He did not object, but it had not been their experience hitherto that they could carry on a Department without expense. As he understood, the expenditure, save such as would fall upon the Consolidated Fund, namely, the salaries of the Land Court Commissioners, would come before Parliament year by year. That was his reading of the Resolution, but perhaps the Secretary for Scotland would presently explain the matter to them. His own impression was that they were taking now another Second Reading debate, so far as they could within the ruling of the Chair. They had already had three days discussion in the Grand Committee and after this financial Resolution was passed, they would be in a position, in the Grand Committee, to discuss financial matters thoroughly; he hoped, therefore, that the Committee would now allow the Resolution to pass. Something had been said about the English txpayer. The opinion of Scotland was that she already contributed too large a share of the general revenue of the country, and that being so the cost of the Bill would fall upon the Scottish and not upon the English taxpayers. Nobody had a right to say that it was the English taxpayer who would have to find the money.

SIR F. BANBURY said that what the hon. Gentleman said might be correct, but it did not make it any better for the English taxpayer that he would have to pay something more as his share of the expenditure under the Bill.

*MR. MORTON said his point was that there was not going to be a special charge upon the English taxpayer in respect of the Bill, and that, as the Scottish taxpayer already paid more than his fair share of the Imperial Revenue, it was upon him the charge would fall. They had no business, therefore, to bring up the complaint that it was the English taxpayers who were going to be called upon to pay for the carrying out of the Bill when it became an Act. The measure would effect a saving of official expenses by altering the existing system, and getting rid of two Boards, viz., the Crofters Commission and the Congested Districts Board. Everybody was aware, who knew anything of the House, that he was as much in favour of economy as anyone, and more so than hon. and right hon. gentlemen opposite ["No"], and all he could say was that they would have full opportunity of discussing these matters in the Grand Committee, and that, therefore, in order to get that opportunity, they should now pass the Resolution, without further delay, of which they had already had too much.

*MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said the hon. gentleman who had just sat down had endeavoured to show that England would not suffer, but that Scotland would incur a heavy burden, because she already paid too large a share of the Imperial Revenue.

*MR. MORTON: I never said anything about a heavy burden. I said that whatever expense the country may be put to would be paid by the Scottish taxpayer.

*MR. COCHRANE said he would point out to the hon. Member that this expenditure was to come upon the Consolidated Fund to which England contributed equally with Scotland. The hon. Member showed that Scotland already paid a larger share of the National burden than she ought to do, and, therefore he ventured to submit that whatever was added to Scotland's expenditure was a further injustice to that country, which was supported by the hon. Member representing a Scottish constituency.

*MR. MORTON: No, no. I do not admit that.

*MR. COCHRANE said he understood that it was the rule of the House that these money Resolutions were not made public, but it was a matter of very great inconvenience to hon. Members that they had not an opportunity of considering important money Resolutions such as the present some days before the debate took place. The absence of that opportunity robbed the discussion of some of its interest; but perhaps when the Resolution came up on Report they would be in possession of further particulars which would enable them to go into greater detail than they could possibly do at present. As a Scottish representative, he had no objection in principle to English money being spent in Scotland, but as an economist he ventured to suggest that the money should be spent with some due regard to economy and efficiency, and that at least some statement should be made by responsible Ministers as to how that money was to be spent. He had glanced at the money resolution and he had looked at the Bill very carefully, and he saw a wide field of expenditure open to them, and, in the absence of any specific information from the right hon. Gentleman, they were unable to form anything like an accurate estimate of what was to be the total expenditure, or how it was to be met. One of the items of the Resolution was that they were to provide the salaries and expenses of the five members of the Land Court, one of whom would have to be an advocate of ten years standing. They were not told how those salaries were to be allocated. Might he ask the right hon. Gentleman why he did not in his Bill state the names of the gentlemen whom it was proposed to appoint members of the Land Court?

*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that disscussion of these details did not arise on the Resolution.

*MR. COCHRANE pointed out that on a similar occasion, with regard to the Land Act of 1881, the House insisted on the names of the Land Commissioners being inserted in the Bill, and that was done before the money Resolution was passed.

*THE CHAIRMAN said they had nothing to do with altering the wording of the Bill, and the hon. Member's point had reference to an alteration of the wording of the Bill. The passing of this financial Resolution was not dependent upon that.

*MR. COCHRANE thought it was a matter of considerable importance to the Committee that they should know the class of men upon whom the money was to be expended. If, however, the Chairman insisted on his ruling he did not propose to proceed further with the point. Perhaps, however, he would be allowed to ask about the allocation of the salaries. He understood that one of these gentlemen was to be chairman, and it would be convenient if the right hon. Gentleman informed them whether he intended to nominate the legal member as chairman. He thought they were entitled to ask what would be the duties of the Land Court. He understood that they would be partly judicial and partly administrative. The Court would have extremely wide powers and functions, and except upon questions of law might state a case to the Court of Session. A Land Court constituted with such wide powers was a very dangerous experiment and might result in grave denials of justice. Let them take, for example, the precedent of the Railway Commissioners. From 1873 to 1888 that body had similar powers, but the cases were so stated that the superior Court could not deal with the merits of the case at issue, and in the year 1888 a free appeal upon all questions of law was substituted. The right hon. Gentleman was proposing to saddle Scotland with a system which had proved to be unworkable and effete. He wished to know why the Land Court should be set up at all. Why was it that the existing sheriffs could not do all the work expected from the new Land Court? The position of a sheriff in Scotland was both judicial and administrative——

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order. That is purely a Committee point. The hon. Member is perfectly entitled to argue that the Land Court ought not to be paid, but he is not entitled to argue that the sheriffs should be the Land Court.

*MR. COCHRANE said he would content himself with saying that many of the duties of the new Land Court could better be carried out under the existing system of Sheriff Courts in Scotland. Those Courts did work similar in character to that which was being imposed upon the Land Court in regard to such questions as the extension of boundaries and the compulsory taking of land for a water supply.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must endeavour to carry out my ruling.

*MR. COCHRANE said that that was almost the only opportunity they would have of discussing the question of the finance of the Bill. When the measure got before the Grand Committee the discussion would be limited to the particular clauses under consideration. He would like to ask a question in regard to the composition of the Land Court. The right hon. Gentleman proposed in the Bill that the tenure of office should not be limited. In the case of the Land Commission appointed in 1881 in Ireland, the tenure of office of the chairman only was limited by the ordinary rules for appointment of Judges, but the tenure of the ordinary Commissioners was limited to seven years. For what reason were they giving a longer tenure to the members of the Land Court here proposed? Under the Bill they were handing over the control of 70 per cent. of the holdings of Scotland to be dealt with by the Land Court and the Agricultural Commissioners. That was to say, that 62,000 out of 89,000 holdings in Scotland, would be so dealt with, and if the cost of the whole estate management as stated by the Member for Leith came to £250,000 a year it was obvious that 70 per cent. would come to about £175,000 a year, and, the holdings being scattered throughout the whole of Scotland, the travelling expenses and salaries of sub-commissioner, valuators, and surveyors would be a serious item, adding considerably to the cost. They had had some experience of the kind in the case of Ireland. He would like the Secretary for Scotland to inform the Committee what particular items in the actual costs incurred in Ireland would not be incurred in Scotland. The officials employed in Ireland cost £101,000 a year for the Land Court alone, and he would like the right hon. Gentleman to give the Committee an estimate of the cost of the Land Court and the Agricultural Commissioners in Scotland. With regard to the setting up of the Board of Agriculture in Scotland, it seemed to him to be a very unwise step and one which he hoped the House would not consider favourably. They had in Scotland every confidence in the existing Board of Agriculture with its efficient and experienced staff of officers, and, in the case of any large outbreak of disease, they had already at their disposal the whole of the staff and equipment of a big office which was quite capable of dealing with cases as they arose. Unless they maintained in Scotland a similiar body they would be placed at a considerable disadvantage and would in fact be in a worse condition than at present. In the present Board of Agriculture they had an office which was solely devoted to agriculture.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is now arguing the merits of the Bill, and that has nothing whatever to do with the financial Resolution which is before the Committee.

*MR. COCHRANE said that the Secretary for Scotland, in a speech delivered quite recently at Edinburgh, had given a sketch of what would be the cost of the new Board of Agriculture, and in the course of his remarks said they were going to establish a Department which in no respect would be inferior to any other Department of the Government. The Agricultural Commissioners in Ireland cost £95,000 a year: was the expenditure contemplated in the case of this Board likely to amount to anything like that sum? It had been stated that the duties of the Agricultural Commissioners would be the laying out of small holdings and the preparing of plans. That would of course require surveyors. In the Works Department the right hon. Gentleman foreshadowed that the employment of valuators and architects would be necessary, and in the case of the fisheries inspectors would have to be appointed, while from the educational side he mentioned the necessity of employing lecturers, teachers, and other inspectors. He also spoke of the development of forestry, sylviculture, and intensive cultivation. All that would probably cost at least £100,000 a year. The Secretary for Scotland had told them in the same speech that that was the deliberate and settled plan of the Government and it had to be placed before the country as a whole. He wished a clear estimate of the whole cost to be put before the Committee. They ought to know the number of Commissioners and Assistant Commissioners, and what salaries they were going to be paid. They should also be told how many teachers and instructors it was proposed to appoint, what salaries they were going to be paid, and what amount was to be allowed for travelling expenses. All that information should be put before the Committee when the financial Resolution was under consideration. The opportunity they had had of considering the Resolution had afforded them a very short time, but they would, perhaps, be able to deal more fully with the question on the Report stage. He noticed that the last paragraph proposed compensation in certain cases to members of the Crofters Commission. He thought that was a point which required some explanation, because the Chairman of the Commission was a Sheriff in Scotland, and drew a salary and a pension already from that office. Was it now proposed to pension an official who was already receiving a pension? He thought that was a very unwise thing for an economical Government which objected to pensions on principle to do. Whatever the right hon. Gentleman said, the ultimate result of the proposals would be the placing of a very heavy burden on the finances of the country, with very little advantage to any part of the kingdom.

MR. SINCLAIR: I shall be very glad to give all the information I can on the subject of the Resolution. We have simply followed precedent in putting the Resolution before the House in this manner. I pass, therefore, from the criticisms on that point. This is an enabling Resolution in order to enable the Committee upstairs to criticise and discuss the money provisions of the Bill. I shall not deal with estimates except in one particular, and I shall not enter upon the comparisons which the hon. Gentleman opposite has invited me to make with regard to the salaries and arrangements elsewhere. I shall deal simply with facts, and I would like to recall the attention of the Committee to the three clauses of the Bill which we are discussing. Nearly all the information which has been asked for is already contained in those three clauses supplemented by the statements made in this House in regard to the proposals of the Bill. In the first place let me remind the Committee that the proposals of the Bill relating to the constitution of the two bodies are based upon Scottish experience. It must be remembered that although two new bodies are created by the Bill, two existing bodies disappear. Let me deal with the Land Court. The Land Court is to consist of not more than five members, and the legal member is not necessarily to be the chairman. The Land Court is to be the successor of the Crofters Commission; it is not an administrative body, it is judicial or quasi-judicial. It is desired and intended that the Land Court shall consist of persons fully qualified and having authority from their experience and position in Scotland to deal with such matters, and these considerations must be borne in mind when the Committee has before them and are considering the salaries proposed to be attached to the appointments and the conditions of their tenure. My hon. friend the Member for the Leith Burghs has made a large estimate as to the cost of the Land Court. An hon. Member asked how many clerks, messengers, valuers, and other staff they would have to appoint. The Court will have full authority, subject to the control of Parliament and the Treasury, as other such bodies have, to appoint their own staff.

*MR. COCHRANE: What estimate have you formed of the necessary equipment of staff?

MR. SINCLAIR: The estimate which has been assumed in this debate has been somewhat large. I would remind the Committee that we have an estimate which will to some extent assist us in the experience of the Crofters Commission. The annual administrative expenditure of that Commission has been about £5,000 a year, and I should say that that is a far safer guide as to the probable expenditure of the Land Court than the estimate which has been given by previous speakers to-day. The expenses of the Land Court, whatever they are, will be under the scrutiny of Parliament. The salaries will be placed on the Consolidated Fund. In that we are following precedent elsewhere, and that will give security and permanence of tenure, which ought to attract the best available and the best qualified men for these offices.

*Mr. MORTON: Will all the salaries be placed on the Consolidated Fund?

Mr. SINCLAIR: No; only the salaries of the members of the Land Court. As to the Agricultural Commissioners, the Committee will be good enough to keep quite distinct the functions of the Agricultural Commissioners and those of the Land Court. It is perfectly true that both these bodies are intended to work in Scotland in relation to the land of Scotland, but it is quite erroneous to deduce from that that their functions cannot be kept perfectly distinct.

Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON indicated dissent.

Mr. SINCLAIR: My hon. friend the Member for the Leith Burghs shakes his head. He is quite entitled to his own opinion, but I would remind him that the work of the Congested Districts Board has been perfectly separate from that of the Crofters Commission, and there has never been any criticism in Scotland as to the quasi-judicial position which the Crofters Commission has held during the last twenty years. Exactly the same principle holds good in the arrangement proposed in this Bill, and if the Bill is read carefully it will be seen that the function of the Land Court is a rent-fixing function. They have to decide between the parties as to rent, and the other portions of the Bill with relation to administration are under the Agricultural Commissioners. Clause 4 says that it shall be lawful to "appoint not more than three persons" as Agricultural Commissioners. It falls to the Agricultural Commissioners to take up, in the first place, the work of preparing schemes for the creation of small holdings. That is one section of their work. The second section is to take up the work which is presently done by the Congested Districts Commissioners — work of the character of that done by the Department of Agriculture. The third function of the Agricultural Commissioners is to take up for Scotland the work which is now done by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. Very fanciful estimates have been given to the Committee this afternoon as the cost of the new Department. Let me ask Members to look at Clause 4, which deals with the matter. Sub-section (2) provides—

> "The Agricultural Commissioners shall be charged with the general duty of promoting the interests of agriculture, forestry, and other rural industries in Scotland, and shall also exercise and perform any powers and duties which are or may be conferred on or transferred to them under the provisions of this Act. In the discharge of their duties they shall comply with such instructions or regulations as may from time to time be issued by the Secretary for Scotland, and they shall submit an annual report of their proceedings to him, which Report shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament."

That is one of the functions to which I have alluded. Sub-section (4) which indicates the second branch of their work is as follows —

> "Without prejudice to the provision of the immediately preceding sub-sections such one of the Agricultural Commissioners as the Secretary for Scotland shall from time to time appoint shall be designated the Commissioner for small holdings and shall be specially charged with the duties hereinafter committed to him."

Sub-section (7) of Clause 4 indicates the further powers that are to be transferred to the Agricultural Commissioners.

*Mr. COCHRANE: Will you give a sketch of what their work is to be?

Mr. SINCLAIR: We are dealing now with the expenditure of these Commissioners. If the hon. Gentleman will give me his attention I think I shall be able to satisfy him on that point. This Department is intended to be a Department of the Civil Service, and the administrative expenses of the Department will be charged on the Estimates, and will come under the control of Parliament every year. The Committee need not be under any apprehension that Parliament will not have as full an opportunity of criticising the expenditure of this Department as that of any other Department of the State. Everything must have a beginning, and it is intended in regard to the appointment of the Agricultural Commissioners to build up gradually, and when the Bill becomes law it need not be at once that the powers should be transferred from the present Board of Agriculture to these Commissioners. The third branch of the powers of the Commissioners will fall to them at once, namely, the powers with respect to the work done by the Congested Districts Board. The intention of the Government is that this Department shall ultimately, when fully developed, constitute a Department of Agriculture for Scotland. I have yet to learn, even from the criticisms which have been made on the proposals to-day, whether it is the opinion of hon. Members that at present we spend too little or too much in developing agriculture in Scotland. The proposals embodied in the Bill are perfectly simple. First of all, there is to be the Land Court which will succeed the Crofters Commission, and exercise over the whole of Scotland powers exactly similar to those now exercised by the Crofters Commission in one portion of Scotland. The next step is the appointment of Agricultural Commissioners who shall, to use the phrase which I have already used in the House, be the nucleus of a Department of Agriculture for Scotland, take over the powers of the Congested Districts Board, and further exercise the powers under the Bill in respect of small holdings, and also in respect of the general supervision of agriculture, afforestation, and other matters affecting the agricultural interests of Scotland. It is impossible, at this stage, to give the information that has been asked for with respect to smaller details by the hon. Member for North Ayrshire. The whole purpose of the Bill is to put the people of Scotland in the position of thinking out and working out for themselves the problems of the country, and things must be left to develop. The hon. Member has complained as to the want of information in regard to the future; but the hon. Gentleman must know that a great public department can grow, and as it developes it requires further support in the way of money, and has to come to Parliament for that money. As for the financial part of the Bill dealt with in the Resolution, £100,000 is provided for its working, made up of £15,000, under the Agricultural Rates Act of 1896, £20,000 which is at present provided by Parliament, and an additional £65,000 which is to be voted in future. Of this sum £35,000 is to be devoted to the congested districts and £65,000 to the remainder of Scotland. Some criticism has been passed to-day on the amount available for the creation of new holdings, it being contended that it will be entirely insufficient. I do not enter into that point now further than to say that the experience of the Congested Districts Board, which I give for what it is worth, is entirely at variance with the suggestion that the cost of the new Board will be so great as in some quarters seems to be anticipated. I submit with great respect to the Committee that the provisions of the Bill are perfectly clear and simple.

*Mr. COCHRANE: What about the compensation to be given to the members of the Crofters Commission?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The new Board will be a Civil Service Department, and consequently the salaries and retiring allowances of its officials will be fixed in consultation with the Treasury. Subsection 8 of Clause 3 is inserted so that no damage may be done by the arrangements made after the Bill is passed into law to the interests of the Crofters Commission, and that subsection was inserted with the sanction of the Treasury. As to the new Commissioners, it does not seem to me to be a wise move to appoint them before Parliament has passed the Bill into law.

*Mr. COCHRANE thought the right hon. Gentleman had misunderstood him. What he wanted to know was whether the right hon. Gentleman could furnish the Committee with information as to the sum he had in his mind for providing compensation to the existing members of the Crofters Commission.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is a matter for future deliberation; but I can say that the public interest, as well as those interested, will be amply protected.

Lord WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said that he would be the last man to vote against the £85,000 being spent for the improvement of agriculture in Scotland, if he thought the money was going to be spent to good purpose; but after listening to the speech of the Secretary for Scotland he thought anyone would be very sanguine if they imagined that would be the case. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the cost of the Land Court was not likely to be very excessive; but it must be remembered that it would deal with all the counties in Scotland, which would necessarily involve large travelling expenses for the inspection of the differences of soil and cultivation in the various parts of the country. He thought the £65,000 for the creation of small holdings would be much better spent in providing houses for labourers on the land. To spend it on small holdings would be but to fritter it away to a great extent, and it would not be the means of getting many people on the land. The Secretary for Scotland had suggested that the hon. Member for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities was wrong in his estimate as to the cost of providing equipment for small holdings, and that £500 was a low estimate of the cost of the creation of a small holding. He had had a little experience with the land question, and he could state that decent cottages in mountainous districts, where there were plenty of stones, could not be provided for less than £250. In addition to that, there was the drainage and equipment to be provided for. He complained of the unsatisfactory answer of the Secretary for Scotland, who had by no means made it clear that large sums of money would not be squandered, or unnecessarily frittered away, in salaries to highly paid officials.

MR. ABEL SMITH (Hertfordshire, Hertford) said that the Secretary for Scotland had given the Committee uncommonly little information in regard to the scope of the Bill. He was sorry that the Prime Minister had left the House, for as he had not given them his assistance in the Scottish Grand Committee, he had hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would have vouchsafed them a little information as to the real meaning of the Bill. Perhaps the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was present, would do so. The Secretary for Scotland had spoken as to the expense of the Congested Districts Board and the Crofters Commission; but this Bill was meant to deal, not only with the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, but with the whole of Scotland. If the expense which would arise under the Bill was anything like the expense incurred by the Crofters Commission and the Congested Districts Board the operation of the Bill would be very restricted indeed. If the right hon. Gentleman sought to create in Scotland a great Department of Agriculture which would have an important effect on the improvement of agriculture in the rural districts, he must admit that that would involve a very large expenditure—infinitely greater than the £65,000 mentioned in the Bill. By the Bill it was sought to establish an entirely novel system in Scotland; yet the Government had never attempted to show that all the proposed machinery was necessary in order to extend small holdings in Scotland.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The hon. Gentleman's remarks have nothing whatever to do with the financial Resolution.

MR. ABEL SMITH said that the money was to be used in setting up a Land Court, the appointment of an Agricultural Commissioner, and a Board of Agriculture, and he thought that they were entitled to say that that was unnecessary.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I have told the hon. Member that he is discussing the merits of the Bill, and he must not reflect upon the decision of the House in regard to that.

MR. ABEL SMITH said that, while submitting to the ruling of the Chairman, he thought they were entitled to have some estimate from the Government as to what the expense of this new Department was likely to be. He must protest against the action of the Secretary for Scotland.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) rose in his place, and claimed to move "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

MR. RAWLINSON (speaking sitting and with his hat on) inquired, as a point of order, whether the Motion would not affect the Amendment notice of which had been given and which he had moved and handed in.

*The CHAIRMAN said that as a matter of fact he had not seen any Amendment. Of course, the Closure Motion would affect any Amendment, because the Question was "that the Question be now put."

Mr. RAWLINSON insisted that his Amendment had been moved and handed in.

*The CHAIRMAN said that even if that had been the case, which it was not, he, on looking at the Amendment which had now been passed to him, saw that it was to the Bill and not to the Financial Resolution before the Committee.

Mr. RAWLINSON remarked that he thought it was headed "Financial Resolution."

*The CHAIRMAN replied that if that was so the Amendment was not correctly drawn. As it was, it appeared to be on the Bill.

Mr. RAWLINSON contended it was to the Resolution.

*The CHAIRMAN read the Amendment and said it apparently related to Clause 3 of the Bill.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 115; Noes, 15. (Division List No. 173.)

AYES.

Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Bertram, Julius
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Idris, T. H. W.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Marnham, F. J.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke-on-Trent)
Waring, Walter
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Rawlinson and Mr. Abel Smith.

Question put accordingly.

SIR F. BANBURY (speaking seated and with his hat on), on a point of Order, said the Chairman had omitted to put the first Resolution, which had reference to £15 000.

*THE CHAIRMAN replied that he really did not know what the hon. Baronet meant. He had put the Resolution to the House and read the whole of it.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 118; Noes, 17. (Division List No. 174.)

AYES.

Asquith,Rt.Hn.HerbertHenry
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bright, J. A.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Buxton,Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies,W. Howell,(Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Harmsworth,RL(Caithn'ss-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)

Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Idris, T. H. W.
Jardine, S. J.
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Kearley, Hudson, E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal,E )
M'Callum, John M.
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
Maddison, Frederick
Marnham, F. J.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Grady, J.
O'Malley, William
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson,Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh Central)
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)

Rea,Walter Russell(Scarboro')
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.D. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds,S.)
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, JohnHenry(Halifax
Williams,Llewelyn(Carm'rth'n
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras,S.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fletcher J. S.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel

Tennant,SirEdward (Salisbury
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Abel Smith.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next.

---

## MERCHANT SHIPPING (TONNAGE DEDUCTION FOR PROPELLING POWER) BILL.

Order for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR F. BANBURY said he had no intention of opposing the Bill, because he believed that upon the whole it was as good a measure as this Government could be expected to bring in. The Bill was a very short one and possibly a very good one, but it was quite impossible for them to understand it without an explanation. There was not even the memorandum which had been usual in the case of Bills of this class. He asked for a short explanation of the measure.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs) said it would be within the recollection of those interested in the Merchant Shipping Bill of last year that Members representing constituencies in which there were docks complained of the system of measurements of ships, and said that the ingenuity of naval architects had been exercised in such a way as to deprive pilots of their legitimate earnings. This Bill was brought in to remedy that state of things. He promised last year that if a private Bill on the subject was introduced, as Bills had been introduced in previous years, the Government would at any rate do what they could to see that the subject was investigated by a Committee. Several Bills were brought in, including that of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, and there was a general feeling expressed by shipowners that it was not a question for private Bill legislation, but that it ought to be dealt with by the Government. He agreed with that view, and the present Bill was introduced. It went upon the principle that the maximum deduction that could be made for propelling power in fixing the net register tonnage should be 60 per cent. of the gross tonnage. There was no interference in regard to crew space. It was very important that every inducement should be given to shipowners to afford as much accommodation as possible for the crews, and, therefore, they decided that there should be no charge by dock owners, pilots, or anyone else in respect of legitimate deductions made in respect of the sleeping, messing, and other accommodation for the crew. The deductions dealt with in the Bill were purely in respect of propelling power. After the measure was introduced, a good deal of feeling arose on both sides. The shipowners thought that it went too far; the dock authorities that it did not go far enough. He invited representatives of both parties to a conference at which all interests were represented—the liners, the dockowners, the trampowners, pilots and others. They held two or three meetings, and eventually arrived at an arrangement which gave satisfaction to everybody, except Mr. Beesley of Penarth, who was very difficult to persuade. It was agreed that 55 per cent. instead of 60 per cent. should be fixed as the maximum, and that to avoid making immediately a change in the law of so considerable a character the Bill should apply to all ships constructed after 1st May, 1907, and to existing ships on 1st June, 1914. In regard to Mr. Beesley's opposition, he proposed that the Bill, if it received a Second Reading, should go before a hybrid Committee, when Mr. Beesley and the interests he represented would have an opportunity of appearing by counsel and of calling witnesses. The Government would support the compromise by counsel, for he thought it would not be fair to put to the expense the shipowners and dockowners who had agreed.

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) said that although the right hon. Gentleman had said that he had consulted everybody, as a matter of fact he had not consulted the Thames Conservancy at all. The suggested alteration from 60 per cent. to 55 per cent. was of great importance to the Port of London. The question of tonnage was a very serious one to the Port of London because it was almost their only source of income. They were obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for bringing in the Bill in accordance with his promise last year, and if they got the 55 per cent. which was suggested they would be fairly content, but he (Mr. Morton) was not quite certain as to the fairness of waiting till 1914 for existing ships.

*SIR J. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth) asked whether the advantages promised by the right hon. Gentleman at the Shipping Conference on the Bill, which applied to ships now being built under contract, would be extended to ships under construction at the same date but not under contract.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE said that the hon. Member put the point before him the other day and he promised that if the words in the Bill did not cover the case the hon. Member put to him he would see that words were introduced for the purpose.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Select Committee of nine Members, five to be nominated by the House, and four by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all Petitions against the Bill presented four clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their counsel, or agents be heard against the Bill, and counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

---

## VACCINATION BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR JOHN BATTY TUKE (Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities), who was indistinctly heard, moved the rejection of the Bill. He had, he said, many objecto the Bill, not the least of them being that it was neither one thing nor another. It would meet the views neither of the vaccinators nor of the anti-vaccinators, and would afford increased opportunities for evading the law, thus constituting a danger to the public health. While not wishing to discuss the methods by which the controversy as it affected the conscientious objector had been conducted, he might be permitted to say that, if it had been conducted on the high level adopted by the hon. Member for West St. Pancras, the whole position would have been much better than it was to-day. He contended that the Bill, if passed, would have the effect of increasing the agitation and the number of the extremists. He believed it would not affect the honest objector to vaccination, for he was at present willing to sacrifice himself and to take some trouble to vindicate his opinions. The really honest conscientious objector was not numerically dangerous. But unluckily, even the honest conscientious objector dragged in his train a large number of persons who had no settled convictions on the subject, such as ignorant or careless parents and guardians; and that was the class that was really dangerous and for which this Bill was devised. The result of such persons merely making a declaration before a Commissioner of Oaths, without giving reasons for belief, would be that in a short time the Vaccination Acts would become useless as a public health measure. The 85 or 90 per cent. of vaccinations which took place under the present law would be reduced to 50 per cent. or even lower. The anti-vaccination societies would spread it abroad that the Acts were practically dead, and literature would be scattered over the country. Possibly those societies might retain the services of Commissioners of Oaths for the express purpose of arranging times and places where the declarations might be made, and it was possible they might arrange for domiciliary visits from door to door for the purpose of getting people to make the declarations. It might become an actual business, as the Commissioner of Oaths would receive from 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. for merely signing his name. He objected to the proposal to put it into the power of the registrars of births and deaths to supplement their incomes by handing, along with the certificate of birth, a leaflet indicating that vaccination might be overrated. Other means might be adopted, but such as he suggested would render the whole thing a farce, and the work of the last thirty or forty years would be thrown away, along with the experience gained by the investigation of a strong Commission, and the results of observation gained in this and other countries. Then we should stand alone among civilised nations. As a humanitarian he could not let the Bill pass, for, as had been well said, it would result in infanticide by omission. There were mysterious influences governing epidemics of infectious diseases. They thought they were done with the plague in Europe, but they had been disillusioned by the epidemic of 1900. The same might be said of spotted fever, and typhoid and diphtheria startled them from time to time. It was true to say that at the present time smallpox was in abeyance, but as surely as the sun would rise to morrow, smallpox would reappear in our midst to work its deadly power amongst us. If the Bill passed, it would find us not only unprotected, but a community unprepared to cope with the pest. A large section of the community would be unvaccinated, and when an epidemic arose there would be a rush of persons to be vaccinated, and then it would be found that the local authorities were not able to meet the demand. Within the last few years, in areas in which smallpox had broken out, people had been seen standing at the doors of vaccination establishment much in the same way as people were accustomed to take up positions outside the doors of a theatre. He often wondered whether the anti-vaccinists had ever seen an epidemic of smallpox among an unprotected community. If they had gone through that experience, as he had on more than one occasion, he thought they could not fail to realise the horrible condition of things that ensued from the outbreak of smallpox. It was also urged against the practice of vaccination that sanitation was a more effective preventive against the disease of smallpox. No one was more willing than he to grant local authorities greater powers in the enforcement of sanitary precautions, but at the same time hon. Members should look at the experience of other countries. Of all European countries, Germany presented the most valuable series of object-lessons. Sanitation there was still very inferior to our own system and practice. In certain large cities in Prussia there had been, no doubt, a great improvement in that respect, but in the small towns the state of affairs was bad indeed. In Germany smallpox could not be said to exist, for the death-rate was represented by a small decimal. At the same time occasional cases did arise. Those were almost invariably on the eastern frontier where people from unvaccinated countries came in. But when the disease did cross the frontier it did not spread. The cases were only sporadic. There was now an epidemic at Metz; but the conditions were not yet known and could not be cited on either side. But he was told that around Metz there were thousands of labourers from Italy, Rumania, and Russia; and, if he were a betting man, he would readily wager that the people whom the epidemic had touched belonged to that unprotected class. With few exceptions, all civilized countries adopted vaccination with great advantage; and in those circumstances were the Government justified in bringing forward this Bill, which sapped the very foundations of the Vaccination Acts? At the instance of a small section of the community, the President of the Local Government Board was throwing the responsibility on to the shoulders of the illiterate; but in the long run the responsibility must be his. But it must be admitted that the time had come for a revision of the working of the Act; and he would suggest that the Bill should be abandoned and a small representative Committee appointed. Such a Committee might arrive at a *modus vivendi* which would be the foundation of a Bill acceptable to all sides. But if this Bill were passed all consideration of the subject would be in abeyance for many years. He begged to move.

*MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) seconded the Motion. He regretted that a matter of such grave importance should be discussed in so thin a House. This Bill would settle nothing. It was regarded by the anti-vaccinists as an instalment leading up to the larger policy of the abolition of the Vaccination Law. He wished to know whether the Government accepted that policy or not. He was quite sure the President of the Local Government Board would not say that he was opposed to compulsory vaccination.

*MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): He says there is no such thing as compulsory vaccination.

*MR. CAVE said he could not agree with the hon. Member. He could not conceive that anyone who had looked at the figures would willingly do anything to diminish the efficacy of the Vaccination Acts. The figures relating to the London epidemic of 1901 were conclusive. It was beyond dispute that, whereas the great majority of the people of this country were vaccinated in 1901, the great majority of those attacked in the epidemic of that year were among the unvaccinated; and the death rate was very much higher among the unvaccinated cases than among the vaccinated. It was beyond controversy from those figures that vaccination was a real protection against attack, and against a fatal termination to attack when it did occur. The overwhelming opinion of this country and elsewhere was in favour of vaccination. But, assuming that it ought to remain compulsory, was this Bill necessary or desirable? Was the present system satisfactorily administered? There had been cases in which magistrates exceeded their powers, but he believed that those cases were very rare indeed, and the cases which had occurred were repeatedly brought forward and, as he thought, magnified by those who were wholly opposed to vaccination. Admitting that there were a few such cases, he thought that an easy remedy might be provided by giving to the applicant a right of appeal, either to the Local Government Board or to some other authority; and also that the certificate of exemption should have effect, not throughout the child's life as at present, but only for a certain number of years. The effect of the Bill was to make it much easier to obtain exemption. He quite admitted that the persons who now claimed exemption came within the category of conscientious objectors; but, if they made the process as much easier as the Bill proposed, they would have persons in all classes, either from mere carelessness or from unwillingness to undergo the trouble incident to vaccination, signing the declaration, and the number of exemptions would be very seriously increased. If that were so, the President of the Local Government Board was taking upon himself a grave responsibility. He believed that, by the Bill, they were running a risk of exposing the people to a serious increase of the very dangerous and loathsome disease of smallpox.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'" (*Sir John Batty Tuke.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): On a previous occasion, on 25th April, 1906, the House will remember that I promised, on behalf of the Government, four or five points with regard to the question of vaccination, both with regard to certificates of exemption and the administration of the Act, and I believe it will simplify the proceedings this afternoon and lead to brevity in debate if I recapitulate what was promised and what the Government intend to do. The first thing we promised was a reduction in the cost of vaccination, which, it is generally agreed, has, in recent years, been unduly inflated. Only the day before yesterday I issued a Vaccination Order that carries out to the full the pledge I gave on 25th April. Then we promised some form of statutory declaration in lieu of the existing exemption certificate; and this Bill gives effect to that promise. Then we promised that we would do our best to secure uniformity of action by the magistrates pending the adoption of the other measures promised, and in May of last year the Home Secretary issued a circular advising magistrates not only to be more discreet, but more reasonable and uniform in the practice of administering the Act. I then said that we would do our best to consider the advisability of transferring the administration of vaccination from the boards of guardians, who, in my judgment ought never to have had this duty, to the public health authorities, in whose purview I think that this duty more reasonably comes. Personally I am strongly favourable to that being done as soon as circumstances will allow. Everyone sees that the Poor Law system is now in the melting pot. The Poor Law Commission is sitting, and until that Commission has reported I cannot carry out what I would like to do, that is, transferring the administration of this Act, with cognate functions and duties, from the boards of guardians to public health authorities so soon as it can be done. I believe that the general opinion of medical men is, whatever their view with regard to vaccination, that the sooner we codify the public health functions and duties which are now distributed over a large number of bodies, some of which in my opinion are not qualified to discharge them, the better it will be. Then I promised that I would consider the suspending of vaccination from early infancy to some sensibly later period. On this point I have the approval of the hon. Member for Sleaford and the Homeric yet approving nod of the hon. and learned Member for Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities, but until those two sides of opinion reconcile themselves more amicably on other phases of the vaccination question than they do on this particular point, I cannot see my way at this moment to redeem my promise, although I am considering the question of suspending vaccination to a later period, and I am personally in favour of it. I am pleased to see that even the Jenner Society recommend suspension and postponement with some unanimity, and I see no reason why we should not trend in that direction. The Government has done its best to keep faith and to fulfil the promises that were made on 25th April of last year. Before I deal with the Bill may I say that it is a subject of congratulation to everybody that the terrible scourge of smallpox is growing smaller by degrees and beautifully less. It is cheering to know that in 1906 in England and Wales there were only twenty-one deaths from this particular disease, while in the great City of London, with nearly 5,000,000 people, there were only twenty-seven admissions and not a single death last year. That, of course, we can all be pleased about, but the rival advocates of different theories will interpret it variously. I do not intend this afternoon, however, to indulge in any medical controversy with the hon. Member for Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities. My promises do not pledge me to rake over the ashes of either the statistical or argumentative controversies with hon. and learned Members who on the medical side are better qualified than I am to take their several parts. I am here to justify the Bill which is before us, and as briefly as I can to say what it is. Its object is to effect an alteration in the system of obtaining exemption from the penalties for neglecting to have a child vaccinated. The Bill is intended to secure that object by substituting a statutory declaration for the certificate of conscientious objection as required by Section 2 of the Act of 1898. It is interesting and important at this moment that the House should realise what happened when the Act of 1898 was passed. The Government of that day had to meet the general opinion of the House, and they decided that some provision should be made for the conscientious objector. Under Section 29 of the Act of 1867 there was a penalty of 20s. for neglecting to have a child vaccinated, and there was another penalty of 20s. for disobedience to a justices' order under Section 31. The Government in 1898 proposed to limit the penalties to one prosecution. The House then said that they did not go far enough, and the right hon. Member for the Ilkeston Division proposed a clause for the conscientious objector which he had good reason for subsequently withdrawing in favour of a new clause brought in by the Government itself. That clause became Section 2 of the Act of 1898, and it is not material at this moment that I should read it. Discussion arose as to the precise form of the clause, especially as to the word "satisfies." It seems to me that those who are responsible for the insertion of the word "satisfies" are, from different points of view, more or less responsible for the necessity of amending the Act as this Bill seeks to do. Since 1898 in regard to the administration of that clause, all that was predicted at the time as to its operation has come to pass, and the right hon. Member for the Ilkeston Division, and the hon. Members for Bethnal Green, and Northampton can claim that they were more prescient than were the framers of the Act of 1898. What has come to pass? Owing to the presence of the word "satisfies" we have a state of things which I venture to say is not respectful to the law, is a nuisance, and should be abated as soon as possible. Even the hon. Member for the Kingston Division of Surrey admits that some of the magistrates have exceeded their powers. In my judgment, they have not only exceeded their powers, but they have gone far beyond that description of the misuse of their powers, and of their exalted position, by doing things which were not contemplated by those who framed the Act of 1898. Let me give one simple illustration of what I mean. Here we have a case in April, 1906, of a refusal of three applications for exemption, at Dorchester Police Court. The Chairman dismissed a fourth application with the remark that he knew the benefits of vaccination, for he had seen them all over the world, and he would never grant a certificate of exemption from vaccination. That admirable weekly paper, *Truth*, makes it a practice to pillory nearly every week the magistrates who indulge in this extra-judicial function of misinterpreting the word "satisfies," and provoking resistance to the Vaccination Act, which, if it had been more reasonably and more fairly administered, would not have received the amount of abuse which it now gets. But we go from the action of the magistrates, of which this is a typical example, to the sober and responsible periodical *The British Medical Journal.* In March, of 1907, they said—

> "We have for some considerable time held the view that the methods adopted by some magistrates towards those applying for certificates are vexatious and likely to foster opposition."

That confirms the general view of the Government that this sort of thing cannot be allowed to go on much longer. It became so intolerable that the Home Office had to quote in two consecutive circulars which the Department issued some words, wisely and weightily addressed to the magistrates by the present Lord Chief Justice, asking the magistrates to do their duty in a way that would not give offence to applicants who wanted to be exempted. The first complaint is that parents are compelled to attend the Court in order to obtain a certificate of exemption, and are more or less placed in a quasi-criminal position. Many people object to go to Court, in regard to what, after all, is more or less a matter of opinion. Secondly, they say that they ought not to be subjected to the necessity of going before the magistrates as they now are; and that, thirdly, they ought not to be asked, as they frequently are, after they have satisfied other conditions, to produce the certificate of birth of the child, a proceeding which costs 2s. 7d. These are the three chief objections to the Act as it stands; and this Bill substitutes a statutory declaration of objection by the objector before a Commissioner for Oaths, or before a Justice of the Peace or before a stipendiary magistrate. This declaration is in a simple form, and is embodied in the schedule to the Bill. I do not think that anybody can say that it is not sufficiently clear. Here is the form of the declaration—

> "I, A. B., in the parish of so-and-so, in the county of so-and-so, being the parent or person having the custody of the child named C. D., who was born on such a date of such a year, hereby do solemnly and sincerely declare that I conscientiously believe that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of the child, and I make this solemn declaration, believing the same to be true, by virtue of the provisions of the Statutory Declarations Act of 1835. Dated this day, declared before me," etc.—

—a Commissioner for Oaths, or Justice of the Peace, or other officer authorised to receive a statutory declaration. On delivery of this, within seven days after making the declaration, to the vaccination officer, the applicant becomes entitled to exemption from penalties without going before the Court. He is, moreover, exempt from the stamp duty which the Chancellor of the Exchequer will generously waive, and then so far as the applicant is concerned, the matter is at an end. He will have to pay the small fee which is necessary under the Statutory Declarations Act of 1835, which fee varies from 1s. to 2s. It may be objected that the Bill will make the way of conscientious objectors too easy. That is a point which has been raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities, but, if he looks up the literature of the subject, he will find that his predictions to-day are a kind of replica of those which were made in 1898. On reference to the figures, we find that the percentage of objections since 1898 has been practically the same. In 1898 they were nearly 5 per cent. of the total vaccinations, that is to say, they went from 3 to 4, and to 4·8 per cent., so that the predictions which were made have not been verified to the extent that it had been thought they would be. I can only add that this Bill is the logical consequence of the illogical findings of the Royal Commission itself, of the Act of 1898, and of the illogical character of the original Act of 1867. It may well be said that we ought to build on a logical basis. But the English people are not a logical people, and I sincerely trust that they will never become so theoretically logical as some would like them to become, and that they will never codify their action to such an extent that they will deprive themselves of that power of initiation and that liberty and capacity for experiment of which this Act is one of the most illuminating illustrations. I can only say that the Royal Commission itself contemplated a statutory declaration of some kind, and in the alternative they wished to call the parent before the local authority. I venture to say that to ask the father to go before the local authority is, from the point of view of the parent, more inconvenient and, perhaps, more irritating to him, than to go before the Magistrate or the Commissioner for Oaths. If you cannot satisfy the modern justice of the peace you will not satisfy the local authority, which might be acting through a single officer, or through a Committee, or through the full body. In my judgment, the local authorities for this purpose would be more unsatisfactory than the magistrates. The hon. Member for the Kingston Division suggested that if the magistrates exceeded their powers, a limited form of appeal should be allowed; but I think he will find it very difficult to invent any tribunal to whom such an appeal could be made. If we decided that it should be a committee of either the parish, urban, or county council, it would at times be more inaccessible to the parent than would the Commissioner for Oaths, the justice of the peace, or the stipendiary magistrate; and, personally, it appears to me that the hon. Member for Kingston by his suggestion has contributed in no way to showing us a road out of our difficulty. Rather, he has shown us how complicated this particular matter is. Then the point arises, who shall be the person who shall be entitled to take the statutory declaration? I have given great consideration to this, and I am satisfied that in the big towns it may be the stipendiary, in the country it must be the justice of the peace, and everywhere it must be the Commissioner for Oaths. It has been suggested that we should have the registrars instead of the Commissioners for Oaths and the magistrates. Personally, I see no reason for this. The registrar in no sense or form is connected with vaccination, and it is undesirable, in my opinion, to create any more vested interests in connection with vaccination. The point with me is what will lead to the most harmonious administration of the Act—which means, who are the largest body of people who should be called upon to carry out this work. There are about 2,000 registrars in England and Wales, and there are from 10,000 to 12,000 solicitors who are commissioners for oaths, and, if hon. Members are in favour of this Bill, or of something that goes beyond it, then they will find it infinitely more convenient to have 10,000 or 12,000 commissioners for oaths, who are five times more numerous than the registrars, and, therefore, to that extent, are more accessible to those intending to apply for exemption. I rule the registrar out altogether; I prefer the 10,000 or 12,000 commissioners for oaths, who will get the fee of 1s. 6d. Then I add to the commissioners for oaths the 17,000 or 18,000 magistrates; and, in my opinion, for the successful working of this

Act, it is necessary to take the line of least resistance, and I therefore think that it will be much better to have 30,000 centres for applicants than to have only 2,000. For this reason I rule out the registrars. In all cases where the magistrates or the justices of the peace receive a fee, they will not receive it personally, neither will the clerk, but it will go into the county fund and be used for some public purpose. The registrar has now the duty of registering the child for another purpose, and that is my strongest objection to his coming in. He has to register the child within six weeks of its birth, and, if he is allowed to do it for another purpose, he will be anxious to register the child for both purposes within six weeks. Anti-vaccinators, as well as those who are in favour of vaccination, I think agree that it would be better to have the child vaccinated near the expiration of four months rather than within the expiration of six weeks. Therefore, that point weighs with me. Another point which weighs with me in the administration of this Act is that we ought not to have any officer, however important his functions may be, to whom the granting of a statutory declaration would mean an increase of his professional business. It is exceedingly important to satisfy all sections in this controversy, and I think that the commissioners for oaths, the magistrates, and the justices of the peace should be regarded as neutral persons who will impartially carry out the Statutory Declarations Act of 1835, and receive their fees for the statutory declaration and for no other purpose. If the registrar were to be called in for fees, then it would be to his interest to discourage or persuade an applicant. The Bill gives the parent a free choice and a simple way of exercising it. I prefer to take the broader and better view that the magistrates, justices of the peace, and the commissioners for oaths are twelve times more numerous than the registrars and, therefore, proportionately more accessible, which is a very important point in the administration of this Act. I have decided, therefore, that the statutory declaration is better in the hands of the magistrates, justices of the peace, and commissioners for oaths, than it would be in the hands of the registrars of births, deaths, and marriages. I sincerely trust that there will not be said of this Bill three or four years hence what was said and predicted of the Bill of 1898. I believe that the nuisance which has grown up under the Act of 1898 is intolerable and cannot be allowed to continue. The conscientious objector resents being insulted in court, and he asks a more convenient way of claiming exemption. I consider that this is a simple and useful Bill for the achievment of that object, and I commend it to the House in the hope that it will be received with hearty sympathy and be read a second time.

MR. PICKERSGILL (Bethnal Green, S.W.) said he welcomed this Bill as being better than nothing, and he regretted that the Government had not seen their way to abolish the penalties altogether. The present position of matters was really very anomalous and absurd. Parliament was induced to pass the Vaccination Acts by the solemn declaration of the medical faculty that vaccination would be an absolute protection against smallpox, but nobody put forward that contention now. He was sorry that the Government had not been bold enough to go so far as to remove the neglect of vaccination altogether from the purview of the criminal law. Taking the Bill for what it professed to be, he hoped the President of the Local Government Board would be prepared to accept Amendments. The right hon. Gentleman had on a former occasion promised that a statutory declaration by either parent should be sufficient, but that was not the effect of the Bill. With regard to the persons before whom the declaration was to be made, it was not suggested that the registrar should be introduced in substitution for the other persons named, but in addition. He thought it would be a great convenience to a parent if, when he went to register the birth of his child, he could at the same time make the statutory declaration. He noticed that the Bill provided that the statutory declaration was to be made within four months. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would be willing, at any rate, to extend that period, if not to strike the limit out altogether.

SIR HENRY CRAIK said he was sure the House was very thankful to the right hon. Gentleman for the very clear explanation he had given of the objects of the Bill. Although he spoke with no professional knowledge, he felt it impossible to remain silent on this question, in view of the fact that such a large proportion of his constituents were interested in medical science. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman had given many reasons why the Bill should be considered as an extremely moderate one, but in view of certain utterances which had come from the opposite side of the House, and from hon. Members below the gangway, he felt that there were considerable dangers to be apprehended beyond those which the right hon. Gentleman had indicated as the limitations of the Bill. He felt that this Bill was a concession to prejudice and ignorance. As it was now drafted, it left no discretion whatever to the commissioner for oaths or justice of the peace, and, therefore, it seemed to him a matter of very little importance in whose hands the duty was placed. He objected to the substitution of a secret signature to a declaration before a commissioner for oaths for a statement of conscientious objection in the light of publicity with the aid that publicity gave to distinguish between ignorance, carelessness, or prejudice and a conscientious belief. How far was concession to go? Granting that there were conscientious beliefs having real and solid foundations, he feared that mere wantonness, idleness, carelessness, and prejudice would largely enter into the action of many for whose good this legislation was devised. Let the really conscientious objector have the courage of his opinions, and not place himself in the hands of agents of anti-vaccination societies, who knew how to work up adherents to their cause. The signature before a commissioner would save some little trouble, and he feared there would be a very serious diminution in the percentage of vaccination, and a serious increase in the number of those who conceived themselves to be conscientious objectors. Should not the investigations of science have some weight in the sanitary administration of the country? Surely it was not too much to say that it was unwise to yield to the pressure of those who were in opposition to the fixed conclusions of the great mass of scientific medical opinion.

SIR F. BANBURY said he shared the feeling that was expressed very strongly in 1898, that the Act of that year went too far in concession to prejudices against vaccination. Amongst a large number of the inhabitants of these islands there was a strong feeling that smallpox was such a very serious disease, and vaccination had been so thoroughly proved to be a preventive to that disease, that the Government were not doing their duty when they allowed a loophole—although it was very carefully fenced round—here provided for. He had expected to hear a few words in defence of the Bill from the anti-vaccination minority, but presumed that, in the face of the great majority of the House, including the President of the Local Government Board, who believed in the full efficacy of vaccination ["No, no"], they feared to advance opinions where they could be thoroughly sifted and dealt with. He challenged the statement of the hon. Member for Bethnal Green that the theory that vaccination and re-vaccination was a protection against smallpox had been given up, and he conscientiously believed that vaccination was necessary for the health of the community. It was with regret and surprise he found the right hon. Gentleman yielding to the pressure of the hon. Member for Sleaford and his friends, and warned him that this concession would only be made the jumping ground for further demands. The chief reason advanced in support of the Bill was that certain magistrates had administered the Act in a manner which was not right. The right hon. Gentleman had quoted an instance where the chairman of a bench of magistrates had said that vaccination was necessary, and under no circumstances would he grant an exemption. He did not know what the other magistrates on that bench could have been thinking about, and he ventured to think that the chairman of no other bench of magistrates in the country would have made such a statement. In the vast number of cases all that magistrates required was that the applicant should go into the witness-box, take the oath, and then state that he had a conscientious objection to vaccination because he believed it would be prejudicial to the health of his child. Speaking from the point of view of one who thoroughly believed in the efficacy of vaccination, he admitted that the right hon. Gentleman's Bill, on the face of it, did not seem to be a very great innovation. There appeared to be some reason in the objection raised by the right hon. Gentleman that going to the police court savoured somewhat a criminal procedure in regard to what was, after all, a civil matter. Vaccination cases were taken before the ordinary police business began. The applicants for exemption orders were not detained for more than a few minutes, and it seemed to him that there was a very great protection in compelling the conscientious objector to go before a public court. If the conscientious objector believed in the failure of vaccination, he should not be ashamed to say so in open court, or to have his name in the papers. But if those proceedings had not to be gone through, there might be a great number of people who, to save a little expense and trouble, and for a variety of other reasons, would avail themselves of the hole and corner procedure provided for by the Bill. He did not wish to cast any aspersion on the machinery provided by the right hon. Gentleman, but there could be no question that it would be more or less a hole and corner procedure. Doubtless a considerable amount of trouble was entailed on the mother by the vaccination of the child, and it might be expected that a great number of people would evade that trouble by availing themselves of the procedure under the Bill. An hon. Member had expressed dissatisfaction that the mother could not obtain an exemption order without the consent of the father. He sincerely hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would not give way on that point, because the father was the proper person to decide whether or not his child should be vaccinated. He was not saying that the mother had not the interest of the child at heart. [AN HON. MEMBER: What is to be done where there is no father?] The living parent or guardian would get the exemption order. That was already provided for under the Bill. When a child was vaccinated it suffered a certain amount of pain, and the mother had to do the nursing, and, that being so, it should not be forgotten that there would be a great temptation on the part of the mother to say "Oh, I don't want to be troubled with this. I fancy it will be all right. I know a case where the children have not been vaccinated and there has been no evil result." When the hon. Member for Sleaford and his friends came along with their delusion the prejudices of the parents were intensified. He felt strongly against the Bill, because he looked upon it as merely the thin end of the wedge, and feared that the result would be the abolition of compulsory vaccination. He would, therefore, vote in favour of the Amendment. He might point out that the only man of science in the House was strongly against the Bill. The right hon. Member for the Ilkeston Division, who was also an expert on the matter, had not been able to get up and say a word in favour of the Bill. When one expert was against the measure, and another could not say anything in its favour, the House had, he thought, strong reason for throwing it out.

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 122, Noes, 14. (Division List No. 175.)

AYES.

Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bright, J. A.
Brooke, Stopford
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Byles, William Pollard
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hn. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Everett, R. Lacey
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Gilhooly, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Higham, John Sharp
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hn. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Grady, J.
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E (Edinb'rgh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Waring, Walter
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, John Henry (Halifax
Williams, Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES

Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bull, Sir William James
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craik, Sir Henry

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir John Batty Tuke and Mr. Cave.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

## RELEASED PERSONS (POOR LAW RELIEF) BILL.

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland), in moving the Second Reading, said that this Bill was not of a controversial character. It dealt with the case of persons discharged from prisons, reformatories, industrial schools and inebriate homes, who, owing to ill health or other causes, had to be sent to the workhouse. At present, when their place of settlement was unknown, they were sent to the workhouse of the union in which the prison or institution from which they were discharged was situated. The effect was that some unions became chargeable with many persons whom they ought not to be made to maintain. The Home Office had received representations on the subject in respect of persons released from the prisons at Parkhurst and Lincoln and many other places. The Wandsworth Union had had to supply relief last year to seventy-nine persons released from Wandsworth Prison. The Bill proposed that, where the place of settlement of the discharged person was unknown, the union where he lived when the offence was committed should be charged with his relief; and, if that was not known, then the union in which the offence was committed. Where persons were too ill to be moved to the union chargeable, they were to be discharged to the nearest workhouse, but the expenses of their maintenance would be borne by the union chargeable under the Bill. It was now twenty-two years since the principle of this measure had been admitted to be sound by the Home Office. On more than one occasion Bills had been drafted to provide a remedy for the grievance. They had been sometimes introduced by private Members, but had never made any progress. He hoped that Parliament would now pass this measure in order to remedy a grievance which was admitted on all hands.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. COCHRANE said a Bill similar to this was before the Home Office during the last Unionist Administration, and, while it was regarded with benevolent feelings, no opportunity occurred for translating those feelings into definite action. He entirely agreed with what the hon. Gentleman had said. It was an intolerable hardship that persons who were discharged invalided from prisons should become chargeable on the local rates of the districts in which the prisons were situated.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now Adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley*,)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at nine minutes before Five o'clock till Monday next.

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Monday, 27th May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

### PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.: Southport, Birkdale and West Lancashire Water Board Bill. [Lords.]

Ordered, that the Bill be read a second time.

### PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill. Local Government Provisional Order (No. 13) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

### PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.:—Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill. Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time To-morrow.

King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill,—read the third time and passed.

London and North Western Railway Bill,—read the third time and passed. [New Title.]

London United Tramways Bill,—read the third time, and passed.

Newquay and District Water Bill [Lords] (Prince of Wales' consent signified),—Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

Penrith Urban District Council Bill,—read the third time, and passed.

Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [Lords],—as amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited, Order Confirmation Bill,—read the third time, and passed.

## *PETITIONS.*

### BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Petition from Bermondsey, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against: From Chichester, and London; to lie upon the Table.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### ARMY.

Copy presented, of Additional Estimate of the Cost of the Territorial Force [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906 (INDUSTRIAL DISEASES).

Copy presented, of Order, dated 22nd May, 1907, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in pursuance of Section 8 (6) of The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, extending the provisions of the Act to certain Industrial Diseases [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### BANKING AND RAILWAY STATISTICS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report on the Banking and Railway Statistics of Ireland for the half year ended 31st

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

December, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### BANN AND LOUGH NEAGH DRAINAGE.

Copy presented, of Report to the Lord-Lieutenant, by Mr. J. D. Bell, Land Valuer, appointed by the Government to make certain valuations in connection with Sir Alexander Binnie's Report on the Bann and Lough Neagh Drainage [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Copy presented, of Return of Advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903, during the month of November, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS.

Copy presented, of Twenty-fourth Report of the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, with Appendices, for the year 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 164.]

### NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Copy presented, of Fiftieth Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1906–7 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### BOARD OF EDUCATION (SPECIAL REPORTS).

Copy presented, of Special Reports on Educational Subjects, Vol. 17, Schools, Public and Private, in the North of Europe [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Summary of Figures relating to State-aided Secondary Schools in England (excluding Wales and Monmouthshire), together with a Memorandum on the Management and Character of those Schools, in respect of Public Control and freedom from Denominational Restrictions [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Wilts), Further Return relative thereto [ordered 9th August, 1901; *Mr. Griffith-Boscawen*]; to be printed. [No. 165.]

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

### Meetings of Land Tax Commissioners for Brixton Division.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if any meetings of land tax commissioners have been held in the Brixton division of Lambeth during the present year; if so, on what date such meetings were held; whether all duly appointed commissioners were summoned to them; and, if not, will he state why certain commissioners were summoned and other commissioners were not.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am informed that meetings for the two Brixton divisions of Lambeth were held on the 8th and 9th April, respectively. In each case all the commissioners were summoned to attend.

### Claims of Fowler & Company, of Cienfuegos, against Spanish Government.

MR. SEAVERNS: To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the claims of Fowler & Company, British subjects, of Cienfuegos, against the Spanish Government have yet been settled; and, if not, will he ascertain why settlement has been deferred for over ten years, and secure some assurance from the Spanish Government that the matter will now receive their attention.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) In my reply to the hon. Member's Question on this subject of 26th March last,† I explained that the settlement of the claim in question, in common with that of other Colonial claims against the Spanish Government, is delayed by the provisions of the law of 30th July, 1904. Until the Report of the Committee appointed to examine the claims has been presented payment cannot, I fear, be expected. His Majesty's Embassy at Madrid are continuing to urge upon the Spanish Government the necessity of hastening the labours of the Committee in question.

### Poor Law Children—Muller's Orphanage, Bristol.

SIR A. SPICER (Hackney, Central): To ask the President of the Local

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 1626.

Government Board if he will state the number of children who have been handed over by the Bristol Board of Guardians to Muller's Orphanage in that city; what sum is paid per head by the guardians to the manager of the orphanage; what control the guardians have over children so handed over; and by what means they are inspected.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I am informed that the guardians have not themselves applied for the admission of any children to Muller's Orphanages. It has occasionally happened that relatives who have made application for admission of children to the orphanages have, pending the consideration of the application or the occurrence of vacancies, had to seek Poor Law relief for the children. In such circumstances the children have been discharged from the guardians' institutions, on the application of the relatives, in order that they may be admitted into the orphanage; but after such discharge the guardians have not exercised any control over the children or visited them. Nor have they made any payments in respect of their maintenance in the orphanages.

### Liverpool Bonded Warehouses.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many bonded warehouses under the Customs' supervision approved for the bonding of wines and spirits were open in Liverpool on the 10th instant; whether they were all in charge of second-class examining officers, and what was the maximum number of warehouses for wines and spirits under the charge of one examining officer at the same time; what is the number of excise warehouses approved for the bonding of wines and spirits in Liverpool; whether they are all in charge of first-class officers of excise; and what was the maximum number of warehouses for wines and spirits open under the charge of one first-class officer at the same time, the 10th instant.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am informed that there were seventy-two bonded warehouses approved for the deposit of wines and spirits under the supervision of the Customs Department in Liverpool open on the 10th instant during the whole or portion of the official day. All these warehouses were under the charge of examining officers, second-class, assisted by watchers as found necessary. The maximum number of warehouses under the charge of one examining officer was six. As regards the second part of the Question, I learn that there are only two excise general duty warehouses in Liverpool for wines and spirits. When open, each warehouse is in charge of a first-class officer of excise. Only one was open on the 10th instant, and it was in charge of a first-class officer.

### Overtime of London Customs Watchers.

MR. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the number of hours' overtime worked by the Customs watchers in the Port of London during the year ended 31st December, 1906; the amount of money paid to them for such overtime attendances during that period; and what portion of the money was paid by merchants and by the Crown respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The overtime remuneration paid to Customs watchers in the port of London (459 on establishment) during the year ended 31st December, 1906, was, I understand, as follows:—

| Number of Hours. | Paid by Merchants. | Paid by Crown. | Total. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | £ s. d. | £ s. d. | £ s. d. |
| 115,864* | 2,522 0 0 | 1,274 12 0 | 3,796 12 0 |

* These figures include 3,591 hours overtime allowed under the regulations for disturbance when the hour for commencing work fell between midnight and 5 a.m. inclusive.

### Registered Parcels Post to China.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Postmaster-General whether under present arrangements for sending parcels by parcel post to China from England, they can only be insured as far as Shanghai unless forwarded by a German boat; and, if so, whether he will take steps for securing for British trade the advantage possessed by other nations.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Parcels from this country for China sent by British packet can be insured as far as any place at which there is a British postal agency. Such agencies are maintained at Amoy, Canton, Chefoo, Foochow, Hangkow, Hoihow, Ningpo, Shanghai, Swatow, Tientsin, and Wei-hai-wei. The only insured parcels sent by the German service are those addressed to places at which there are German agencies but no British agencies, namely, Itschang, Nanking, Peking, Tschinkiang, Tsinanfu, and Weihsien, as well as the Kiantschou Protectorate. Negotiations have already been begun with a view to the extension of the British Parcel Post arrangements with China.

### Compulsory Registration of Title—Working of the Act in London.

SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether, having regard to the fact that the experiment of compulsory registration of title in the county of London for the past eight years, under the Land Transfer Act, 1897, is practically a failure and very adversely affects the marketability of property in London by adding greatly to the expense, difficulty, and delay in dealings with property, the Government have considered, or will consider, whether the Privy Council Order applying the experiment to London should be revoked; and whether any other county in the United Kingdom has applied for the application of the Act.

(*Answered by Sir John Walton.*) The Government have no intention of recommending that the Order in Council should be revoked, but have it in contemplation to inquire into the working of the Land Transfer Acts with a view to the removal of any alleged objections. No other county has applied to be brought under the Act.

### Customs and Inland Revenue Irregularities in Ireland.

MR. CLELAND: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether a settlement has been arrived at in connection with the recent irregularities in distilleries in Ireland; and in how many cases the Board of Inland Revenue and the Board of Customs, respectively, have during the past twenty years imposed fines of £50 or over on the sureties for bonded warehouses or distilleries for irregularities discovered thereat; and what were the amounts of the penalties imposed.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The case arising out of the recent irregularities at Tullamore is not yet settled. Neither of the Revenue Boards has any record of the imposition of a fine of £50 or over on the sureties for a bonded warehouse during the period stated. It is not the practice to require sureties for a distillery to which no warehouse is attached.

### Price of Opium at Calcutta Sales.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India what was the price realised per chest of opium at the Calcutta sales held in March, April, and May, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The average price realised in March was Rs.1,511 a chest, and in April, Rs.1,454 a chest. The May figures have not yet been received.

### Improvement of Irish Harbours.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will give the names of the harbours on the Irish coast in respect to proposals for the improvement of which the Board of Works have reported to the Irish Government within the past five years.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*)—

County Antrim—Ballycastle Harbour, Ballywillan Pier, Portmuck Pier.

County Clare—Liscannor Harbour.

County Cork—Union Hall Pier.

County Donegal—Ballyness Pier, Buncrana Pier, Bundoran Pier, Cladnageragh Pier, Downies Bay Pier, Falcorrib Slip, Gortnasate Harbour, Malinbeg Boatslip, Newbridge Pier, Portnoo Pier, Rathmullen Pier.

County Down—Portavogie Pier.

County Dublin—Balbriggan Harbour, Rush Pier.

County Galway—Cleggan Pier, Clifden Pier, Kilmurvey Breakwater, Arran Island, Kinvarra Harbour, Mason Island Pier, Roundstone Pier.

County Kerry—Dingle Pier, Renard Point Pier, Rineen Pier.

County Londonderry—Magilligan Point Pier, Portstewart Harbour.

County Louth—Drogheda Harbour.

County Sligo—Sligo Harbour.

County Waterford—Ardmore Slip and Breakwater, Ballynagaul Harbour, Passage East Pier.

### Irish Ancient Monuments.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will give the names of the ancient monuments situated on estates being sold under the Act of 1903, communicated by the Estates Commissioners to the Board of Works.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have, in pursuance of Section 14 of the Irish Land Act of 1903, communicated to the Board of Works particulars of the fifty-two ancient monuments named below which they considered might be worthy of preservation:—

Carbery Church—County Kildare.
Carbery Castle—County Kildare.
Lismateige Castle—County Kilkenny.
Ola Castle—County Limerick.
Sinners Stone—County Cork.
Bremore Castle—County Dublin.
Leac-an-scail—County Kilkenny.
Augustinian Friary—County Kilkenny.
Ballycowan Castle—King's County.
Srah Castle—King's County.
Heathstown Castle—County Westmeath.
Cranoge—County Westmeath.
Tomdeely Castle—County Limerick.
Tomdeely Church—County Limerick.
Mahee Castle—County Down.
Mahee Round Tower—County Down.
Mahee Church—County Down.
Templeaveigh Church—County Meath.
Ballyboggan Abbey—County Meath.
Mulrankin Castle—County Wexford.
Rathronan Castle—County Wexford.
Neigham Castle—County Kilkenny.
Wonderful Barn—County Kildare.
? Castle—County Westmeath.
? Castle—County Westmeath.
Giant's Grave—County Dublin.
Puck's Castle—County Dublin.
Shankhill Castle—County Dublin.
Cromlechs—County Dublin.
Carrig Castle—County Tipperary.
Kells Abbey—County Kilkenny.
Mylerstown Castle—County Kildare.
Gortnaclea Castle—Queen's County.
Clonburren Castle—Queen's County.
Colbally Church and Raths—Queen's County.
Chair of Kyle—Queen's County.
Cornaveigh Castle—County Cork.
Troy Castle—County Limerick.
Moymet Castle—County Meath.
Dungall Port—County Antrim.
Drumfane Moate—County Antrim.
M'Quillan's Castle—County Antrim.
Caherbewly Rath—County Tipperary.
Round Tower—County Down.
Seahorse Memorial—County Waterford.
Cragg Castle—County Tipperary.
Giant's Graves—County Tyrone.
Kilconnell Castle—County Tipperary.
Newcastle Castle—County Limerick.
Ballycatteen Rath—County Cork.
Downmacpatrick Castle—County Cork.
Giant's Grave—County Donegal.

### Application of Surplus Income of Irish Church Temporalities Fund.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will call the attention of the Irish Land Commission (Church Property Department) to the desirability of showing in future reports how the surplus income of the Irish Church Temporalities Fund is applied in detail and not merely saying it is applied in payment of debts.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) If the hon. and learned Member will refer to the Report of the Church Temporalities Commissioners, 1869–80 [C. 2773 of 1881], the Annual Reports of the Land Commission since 1881, and the Appendices to the latter Reports under the head of "Financial Temporalities of late Established Church," he will find full particulars of the application of the revenues of the late Established Church, as regards both the discharge of the annual charges imposed by Parliament and the application of any available surplus to the payment of capital debts.

### Maintenance of Supreme Courts of Judicature in Ireland.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state to whom it is proposed to transfer the power and duty of lighting, heating, and maintaining the courts and offices of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland as from the 31st March, 1909; whether the cost of doing so is at present defrayed out of the moneys voted by Parliament to the Board of Public Works; and has this cost been considered in estimating the the future liabilities of the Irish Council.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The cost of lighting, heating, and maintaining the courts and offices referred to is at present defrayed out of the Vote for Public Works and Buildings, Ireland. Under the Irish Council Bill this cost will not fall upon the Irish Fund. As to the arrangements to be made for the future performance of this work, I would refer to Clause 21 (3) of the Bill.

### Deductions from Death Duty Grant to County Wexford.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state in respect of what were the deductions made from the death duty grant, payable to the County Council of Wexford, in the years 1900 to 1907, inclusive.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The net deductions from the death duty grant payable to county Wexford in the years 1900 to 1907, inclusive, were as follows:—

| Year ending 31st March. | Land Commission. Under Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891. | National Debt Commissioners. Under Irish Land Act, 1903. |
|---|---|---|
| | £ | £ |
| 1900 - | 738 | — |
| 1901 - | 972 | — |
| 1902 - | 996 | — |
| 1903 - | 153 | — |
| 1904 - | 590 | — |
| 1905 - | 500 | 35 |
| 1906–7 - | 346 | 2,427 |
| | 4,295 | 2,462 |

The transactions under the Act of 1891, were in respect of advance dividend and arrears of annuities, the respective amounts being approximately £3,113 and £1,182. The transactions under the Act of 1903 are apportionable as follows:—

| | £ |
|---|---|
| Arrears of Annuities - - - | 200 |
| Unearned dividend on issues of stock | 868 |
| Advance dividend - - - | 499 |
| Interest due but not received - | 567 |
| Unproductive balance - - - | 328 |
| | 2,462 |

### Cost of Irish Departments.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return of Irish Departments (Costs, Income, and Expenditure) of which notice stands on the Order Paper.†

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I propose to lay upon the Table in the course of a few days a Return which will include the bulk of the information asked for by the hon. Member, and I would therefore ask him to await the appearance of that Return.

### Sale of the Estate of Mr. Westley, High Park, Kiltegan.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, owing to a deadlock in the negotiations for the purchase by the tenants of the estate of Mr. Westley, High Park, Kiltegan, County Wicklow, the Estates Commissioners were appealed to by the tenants to intervene as arbitrators, and that the landlord declined to agree to arbitration; will he say whether the landlord stated to the Commissioners the grounds of his refusal, and whether the Commissioners propose to take any steps towards effecting a sale of this estate to the tenants.

---

† Irish Departments (Cost, Income, and Expenditure.) Return showing, for the latest financial year, the cost, income from all sources, and expenditure of each of the eight Irish Departments proposed to be placed under the control of the Irish Council, and the total; the cost, income from all sources, and expenditure of each of all the Irish Departments not proposed to be placed under that control, and the total; the total payments and expenditure for and in connection with land by the Congested Districts Board, the Land Commission, and the Estates Commissioners, respectively, with monetary return or set-off, if any; the total amount paid as bonus under the Land Act of 1903; and the total net loss incurred under each heading of loss under that Act from the 1st day of November, 1903, to the latest date for which the figures are available.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) At the request of the tenants the Estates Commissioners approached the owner of the estate, offering their services as conciliators under the Lord-Lieutenant's regulations. In reply they were informed that the owner did not at present desire their intervention, but no reasons were given. In the circumstances the Commissioners cannot take any further action in the matter at present.

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Blue-Jackets' Free Kits.

MR. BROOKE (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is considering the advisability of granting to blue-jackets the same advantages with regard to a free kit as are now given to soldiers and marines; and, if so, when he will announce the Admiralty's decision on the matter.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The Admiralty have considered this question, and decided that it is not feasible to introduce the change at the present time.

### Midshipmen's Instruction Fees.

MR. BROOKE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, seeing that it is proposed to substitute lieutenants as naval instructors in the place of the present holders of that office, midshipmen will still be required to pay 3d. a day out of their pay of 1s. 9d. a day for their naval instruction.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: This question is now under consideration.

### Naval Gunnery.

MR. PARTINGTON (Derbyshire, High Peak): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if, owing to the publication of figures of merit, it has lately become the rule in the Navy to carry out firing exercises only under the most favourable conditions of wind and weather.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: There has been no change in the Regulations, but it is obvious that firing exercises at sea can, as a rule, only be carried out when the weather is sufficiently favourable to permit of boats approaching the target to repair or replace the canvas.

MR. STANGER (Kensington, N.): Is there any truth in the report that appeared in the papers this morning that the Admiralty intend considerably to reduce the staff of the gunnery training establishment at Portsmouth?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: My hon. friend, no doubt, alludes to the statement in the *Standard* this morning. I am astonished that such a statement should appear in any newspaper. It is an absolute lie.

### Destroyers' Armaments.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether forty 12 pounder guns, fitted in our ships to enable them to resist the attacks of torpedo craft, have been removed in order to provide an improved armament for the river class of destroyers; and, if so, what steps are being taken to replace this important section of this armament; and whether he can state why the guns were not ordered in the usual way.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The guns which are being fitted in the torpedo boat destroyers do not form part of the anti torpedo boat armament of ships.

### Lance-Corporals.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can yet say whether lance-corporals will be appointed in the Territorial Army or not.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): No, Sir. I am not yet in a position to make any statement on this point.

MR. ASHLEY: When will the right hon. Gentleman be able to say?

MR. HALDANE: I hope before long.

### Soldiers' Kits.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can yet say whether the Territorial soldier on joining will receive a free issue of underclothing and necessaries, and on whom the annual cost of maintenance of these articles will fall.

Mr. HALDANE: It is not intended to give a free issue of underclothing to the Territorial Force; the question of whether any articles included in the term "necessaries" should be given is under consideration.

### Cost of Army Walking-out Dress.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what will be the cost, in excess of the approximate estimate of the Territorial Force contained in Cd. 3296, entailed by providing walking-out dress for the Territorial soldiers.

Mr. HALDANE: Will the hon. Member kindly refer to Cd. 3369 recently presented, wherein he will find the figures he requires. The estimate for the second suit amounts to £113,000.

### Territorial Artillery.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what will be the whole establishment of guns of the proposed Territorial artillery, and what will be their dates and patterns.

Mr. HALDANE: It is proposed to organise the Territorial divisions on lines similar to those of the Regular Army with, in addition, a few batteries of mountain artillery and possibly some siege artillery. The exact detail of numbers has not yet been settled. The field gun will be the 15-pounder recently in the possession of the Royal Field Artillery; the heavy gun will be the 4·7-inch quickfiring gun already in the hands of some Volunteer corps.

Mr. ASHLEY: Is it intended to convert the field guns?

Mr. HALDANE: Yes, Sir.

### Yeomanry Arms.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that no decision has been arrived at respecting the armament of the Yeomanry, he will leave it to the discretion of individual commanding officers as to whether their men should carry bayonets, which are most uncomfortable for men to wear when on horseback.

Mr. HALDANE: I am not at this period in a position to make any statement on this subject.

### Yeomanry Equipment.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the consideration of all questions affecting the equipment of the Volunteers has been postponed, and, if so, from what cause.

Mr. HALDANE: Pending the formation of the Territorial Army, it would be premature to decide on changes in the dress or equipment of Volunteers.

Mr. ASHLEY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what will happen in cases where the county associations are not formed for two or three years?

### Enlistment Minimum Age.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the minimum age for enlistment into the infantry; and whether there is any intention of changing the age at present fixed.

Mr. HALDANE: The minimum age for enlistment into the Regular infantry is eighteen years. There is no present intention of changing this limit.

*Mr. ASHLEY: Does the right hon. Gentleman consider seventeen a sufficient age for a youth to enter the first class of the Army Reserve, when the Regular Infantry cannot be enlisted in till eighteen?

Mr. HALDANE was understood to reply that it was a convenient arrangement to enlist a certain number of men into the Militia at seventeen with a view to their subsequently passing into the Regular Army.

### Rand Mine Strikes—Employment of Imperial Forces.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Secretary of

State for War whether the cost of sending British troops from Pretoria to Johannesburg to keep down the British miners on strike and of maintaining these troops at Johannesburg will be borne by the Colonial or by the Imperial Exchequer.

MR. HALDANE: If any extra expenditure is involved by the employment of the troops to aid the civil power in this Colony a claim for such extra cost will be made upon the Colonial Government.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Who made the application to the general officer commanding in Pretoria or Johannesburg for these troops, and what was the alleged reason for their being sent to the Rand?

MR. HALDANE: That is a Question which should be addressed to the Under-Secretary for the Colonies.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): Can the right hon. Gentleman state the number of troops sent to the Rand?

MR. HALDANE: I think there is rather a misapprehension as to the position of a soldier in relation to an unlawful assembly. He is under no special military liability; his liability arises out of the fact that as a civilian he is, like other civilians, liable to be called upon to assist the Crown in putting down riot. He exists upon a more handy footing, in a more handy position, than the ordinary civilian, and therefore he is more often called in.

MR. WEDGWOOD: Why were the Volunteers in the Transvaal not called out, or was it suspected that they would decline?

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The responsible Minister of the Transvaal made an application to the High Commissioner for the assistance of the Imperial troops in maintaining order, and the High Commissioner, acting upon his authority and responsibility, directed that such necessary assistance should be afforded by the Imperial troops. I believe that about 800 soldiers have been sent from Pretoria to Johannesburg.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): Has the right hon. Gentleman's attention been drawn to the fact that when the news was circulated on the Stock Exchange in London that Imperial troops had been employed to ride down Britishers working on the Rand, it was received with acclamation, and the price of shares went up?

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Member has no authority over the London Stock Exchange.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): Are we to take it that when civilians are called upon to assist the police they are entitled to use firearms?

MR. HALDANE: I did not say that. The law is that anybody who calls for assistance in putting down, say, a riot or unlawful assembly does so at his peril. If he calls for more assistance than necessary he is guilty of manslaughter, and it may be of murder. He calls for just so much force as is necessary to put down what he has to cope with. That may be, as in the case of Featherstone, an extremely serious riot, or it may be something very slight.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) asked whether the soldier who was called upon went as a soldier or as a civilian, and in what capacity he took his bayonet and rifle.

MR. HALDANE said that he went as a citizen and was personally amenable to the civil law. He was liable as a citizen to be called on to give assistance to the Crown in redressing disorder, and if he took his bayonet he only did so in view of the extreme seriousness of the situation. Anybody calling upon a soldier might find himself in trouble.

MR. LEA asked whether it was not a fact that the chief ground for sending the troops from Pretoria to Johannesburg was to overawe the Chinese rather than to guard against any dangers from the strike of the workmen.

MR. CHURCHILL said that this was a very complicated matter, indeed the most complicated that he had ever anything to do with. He did not feel it to be possible to discuss the question of the strike in Johannesburg by mere interpellations; but he did think that the presence of 50,000 Chinese on the Rand was an element which added to the general insecurity of the country and which justified the High Commissioner in affording additional assistance.

MR. ASHLEY asked whether the soldier was not liable to be tried by court martial if he did not go to the aid of the civil power.

MR. HALDANE said that this subject was one of the most obscure questions that could be discussed in jurisprudence. Sir James Fitzjames Stephen took one view of it, and other eminent authorities took a different view; but if the hon. Member wished to find the fullest statement of the law he knew, it would be found in the Report of Lord Bowen's Committee on the Featherstone disturbances. It contained an exhaustive statement as far as the law was ascertained on the whole subject.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) asked whether the Government's intention was that troops should be permanently maintained in the Transvaal at the cost of this country.

MR. HALDANE: No.

MR. J. WARD asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had more recent information than was contained in the newspapers with regard to the proceedings connected with the dispute in Johannesburg. Was any effort being made by the Government to bring about a settlement?

MR. CHURCHILL said that at present he was not very fully informed as to the details of this dispute; but the policy the Government were at present pursuing was to give what aid was thought to be necessary to the new Government in dealing with this matter—a Government, it should be remembered, which had been largely supported by many of the men now on strike.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Transvaal Government have asked for the help of Imperial troops to suppress a labour strike; and whether he will withdraw at least a portion of the military forces of the Crown from South Africa, and in this way discourage the employment of the Regular Army on police duty.

MR. HALDANE: The duty of the Regular troops, wherever stationed, is to assist in the maintenance of order whenever called upon by the civil authorities. The question of the garrison of South Africa does not arise.

*MR. MACKARNESS: Are we to understand that the Transvaal Government asked for 800 troops to be used solely against white miners?

MR. HALDANE said he would inquire as to that.

MR. BYLES: If the troops had been withdrawn from South Africa these "bayonetted civilians" would not have been so handy.

MR. HALDANE: They happened to be there, and being there we used them.

### Flogging in India.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has received any reply from the Government of India in reply to the despatch he addressed to that Government about a year ago regarding public floggings as a judicial punishment in India; and whether he is prepared to take any steps towards the elimination of this form of punishment from the criminal code of the country, except in cases where the offender is guilty of gross and violent crime against the person.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): A reply has been received and is now under my consideration. I am not prepared to make any statement on the subject at present, but I hope there will be no long delay.

### St. Paul's School, Darjeeling.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he is now in a position to give any information regarding special grants to St. Paul's School at Darjeeling, about which he sent inquiries to India in December last.

MR. MORLEY: Special financial aid has for the last five years been given to St. Paul's School, as it is considered essential that a school of a good standard should be maintained in the hills for European boys in Bengal. The rules for European schools provide for such grants being given, and also that no grants shall be given for instruction in religious subjects. Such aid is available to other denominational schools if they apply for it and are willing to submit to the conditions.

### Education in British Central Africa.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government has decided to make any grant in aid of education in British Central Africa Protectorate.

MR. CHURCHILL: A sum of £1,000 has been provided for the current financial year for this purpose, and the Commissioner has been asked to frame a scheme to be submitted to the Secretary of State, for the appropriation of the money in the best interests of native education.

### Canadian Mail Steamers.

MR. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there are at present five steamship lines which convey passengers to Canada; and whether it is proposed, in the event of a subsidised fast mail service to Canada being initiated, to grant any compensation to the lines now competing for this trade.

MR. CHURCHILL: My hon. friend's Question is premature. His Majesty's Government have promised to examine very carefully the proposals which have been submitted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to the Imperial Conference, and which have been in general principle, apart from all questions of cost and detail, approved by that body. Such an examination must necessarily take some time, and until it is completed I do not perceive the advantage of the official promulgation of detached and partial facts elicited by Question and Answer, and designed by the questioner to point a particular moral in this direction or in that. If my hon. friend will wait until the proceedings of the Conference are published—I hope at the end of this week—he will be able to see exactly where and how we stand in this matter. But meanwhile His Majesty's Government cannot admit the principle that if one line of steamers is subsidised by the Government the other lines running on the same route should be compensated.

### Indian Natives in Nigeria.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that six natives of the Punjab, who recently resigned Government service in Nigeria, are returning to India with a sense that they have been harshly treated; and whether he will inquire into the matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: It is the case that six natives of the Punjab, who have recently resigned their appointments in Northern Nigeria are at present in this country on their way back to India. They have submitted to the Secretary of State a statement of their case, and the hon. Member may rest assured that it will receive attention.

### Murder of Mr. Veal in Natal.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give the House information of the judicial proceedings in Natal relating to the murder of Mr. Veal during the recent rebellion; whether nineteen natives have been charged with this one murder; whether seven of them have already been found guilty and sentenced to death; whether they were tried by civil court or by court martial; and whether, the rebellion being over and order restored in Natal, the Colonial Office will advise the Govenor to intervene and, if possible, prevent a repetition of the events which last year necessitated intervention, when a number of natives were executed for the murder of a single white man.

MR. CHURCHILL: This murder took place during the rebellion, but the victim was an unarmed civilian, travelling alone on a bicycle. The circumstances are recorded in the Governor's despatch of 5th July, 1906 (p. 12 Cd. 3247) which shows clearly that a large number of persons were participants in the crime. Nineteen men were originally charged, but the Crown withdrew the case against twelve of the accused, the remaining seven prisoners were found guilty and sentenced to death. All the proceedings were conducted in the ordinary civil courts of the Colony, martial law having ceased. The power of pardon in capital cases in these Courts is regulated in the Governor's instructions, and the Governor will, no doubt, carefully follow the procedure therein laid down. The Secretary of State is therefore of opinion that he is not in a position to intervene as suggested by the hon. Member.

### Anti-Opium Remedies.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the statement by Mr. L. Wray, Director of Museums of the Federated Malay States, in regard to the new anti-opium remedy and to the results obtained from its use in Selangor; also to the statement that at the Weld Road establishment of the Selangor Anti-Opium Society, in Kualo Lumpur, from 16th to 23rd November last, about 400 patients had reported that they were completely cured of the habit of opium smoking; and whether, under these circumstances, His Majesty's Government will appoint a Committee to investigate the matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have not seen the statement to which the hon. Member refers, but the High Commissioner for the Federated Malay States reports that there is considerable conflict of opinion with regard to the alleged cure. The Government Analyst of the Straits Settlements has been unable to find any special constituent in the plant or plants from which the decoction is prepared, and it is said that the same effects have been produced by a strong infusion of tea. A further analysis is now being conducted at the Imperial Institute, and pending a report on the results it would be premature to consider the question of appointing a Committee

### Chinese Anti-Opium Movement.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has received Reports of the progress of the anti-opium movement in China from the local consuls, missionaries, and other sources; and, if so, whether these Reports will be collated and Papers laid upon the Table at an early date.

MR. CHURCHILL (for Sir EDWARD GREY): Reports have been received tending to show that practical steps are being taken in many parts of China to give effect to the anti-opium regulations issued by the Chinese Government. But in view of the short time that these regulations have been in force—only since February last—the information is, as might be expected, hardly sufficiently definite and authoritative to lay before the House. The question of laying Papers will be considered as soon as the particulars received are likely to be of assistance in enabling a definite opinion to be formed as to the effectiveness of the regulations.

### Indian Opium in China.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any despatch has been sent to the Government of China in reply to the proposals presented to the British Government on the 29th November last regarding the traffic of Indian opium to China; and, if so, whether Papers on the subject will now be laid upon the Table.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The views of the Government of India are still under consideration, but His Majesty's Government hope to be in a position very shortly to reply respecting the proposals of the Chinese Government.

MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) asked if it were not the case that in Pekin Chinese opium shops had already been suppressed?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Shanghai Municipal Gaol.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to the scene witnessed in the mixed court at Shanghai on 18th May, when the thirteen ringleaders in the outbreak at the municipal gaol a year ago were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, and all begged to be sent to the city gaol, declaring that decapitation would be preferable to imprisonment in the municipal gaol, and all had to be removed by force; and whether inquiry is being made into the circumstances and character of imprisonment in the Shanghai municipal gaol.

MR. CHURCHILL: My right hon. friend's attention has been called to the Press report of the scene referred to by the hon. Member, but he has no official information on the subject. It is probable that the objection of the prisoners to the municipal gaol was due to the superior discipline of the latter. A report has been asked for, and it may be added that in November last the Mixed Court Magistrate visited the gaol and expressed his appreciation of the system upon which it is governed, and his satisfaction at the treatment accorded to the prisoners.

### Smyrna Brigandage—Mr. Abbott's Ransom.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if any reply has been received from the Turkish Government to the request made for the repayment of the ransom paid by the British Government for the release of Mr. Abbott; and whether there is any connection between this payment and the fresh capture by brigands in the neighbourhood of Smyrna.

MR. CHURCHILL: No reply has yet been received from the Turkish Government. With regard to the second part of the Question, we have no information beyond what has appeared in the Press, as to the alleged fresh capture by brigands near Smyrna, which is not that of a British subject.

In answer to a further Question by Mr. Fell,

MR. CHURCHILL said he was no great authority on the varying methods of paying ransoms to brigands.

### Consols.

MR. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, seeing that only £1,876,069 14s. 7d. nominal value of 2½ per cent. Consols were purchased by the Government during the last year between 14th May, 1906, and 13th May, 1907, for redemption purposes, he will consider the desirability of using a much larger proportion of the amount set aside for the reduction of debt this year for purchasing Consols, owing to the present low value.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): I do not think it would be to the public interest for me to tie my hands by any declaration as to the particular securities to the cancellation of which I propose to devote the Sinking Fund during the present year, but my hon. friend may rest assured that the comparative advantages of the various securities to which the Sinking Fund can be applied (in estimating which the price at which they can be purchased is, of course, an important element) will be very carefully considered on each occasion.

### Motor Accidents in the Metropolis.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if a Return of the accidents caused by motors in the Metropolitan area has been furnished by the police; and if he can state the number during the last six months.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The number of accidents in the Metropolis known to the Police to have been caused in the streets by motor cars, motor cycles and motor omnibuses during the six months ended the 30th April last is 4,451. Of these accidents personal injury resulted in 1,175 cases, and fatal injury in forty-one cases.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R. Holderness): Can the right hon. Gentleman give a similar Return as to accidents caused by vehicles drawn by horses?

MR. GLADSTONE: I have already done that, and if the hon. Member wishes the figures can be brought up to date.

### Motor Fatalities.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state how many fatal accidents have been caused by motors since the 1st May, 1907.

MR. GLADSTONE: No, Sir; I cannot give this information.

### Russian Social Democrats.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the Russian delegates who are now holding a conference in London are being shadowed and their photographs taken by private detectives and police from Scotland Yard; and whether he intends taking any action in the matter.

*MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston); At the same time I wish to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state whether the police have been and still are engaged in watching and following from their place of meeting to their residences the Russians who describe themselves as Social Democrats, and are now holding a Conference in London; whether he is aware that these men have repudiated any connection with Anarchists; if he will state at whose instigation and by whose authority the police are watching and following these men; and whether the information obtained by the police will be given to the Russian police or Russian Government.

MR. GLADSTONE: The Russian Social Democrats at present holding a Conference in London are not being and have not been shadowed by the Metropolitan police, nor have their photographs been taken by the police. His Majesty's Government never interferes with political freedom and is not doing so. The police have standing instructions to take all steps which may be necessary, without distinction of nationality, to prevent crimes of violence being prepared or carried out in this country or elsewhere.

MR. THORNE asked why so many private detectives were hanging round the place all day.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have absolutely no knowledge of it.

*MR. CREMER said the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the most important part of his Question, namely, at whose instigation and by whose authority these men were being watched, and whether the information obtained by them would be given to the Russian police or Government.

MR. GLADSTONE said that he had already stated that the Russian Social Democrats now holding a Conference in London were not being shadowed by the Metropolitan Police, nor had their photographs been taken by the police.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich); Can the right hon. Gentleman assure the House that no foreign detectives are following these men, who are entitled to the protection of the British flag?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): They are Russian subjects.

MR. GLADSTONE: I know nothing of foreign detectives.

### Licensed Premises.

MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state what was the number of premises licensed by justices for the sale of intoxicating liquors on the premises, and the number of such premises for off sale, respectively, existing on the 1st of January, 1907.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not in possession of the actual figures desired by the hon. Member; but the information contained in the volume of Licensing Statistics for 1906 enables an estimate to be made, according to which it would appear that on-licences numbered about 97,700 on 1st January last, and off-licences about 25,100. The actual figures will be given in due course in the Licensing Statistics for 1907.

### Betting by the Working Classes.

MR. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that, since the passing of the Street Betting Act, a system has sprung up whereby men and women employed in factories are offered special facilities for betting, by means of bookmakers' agents employed in the works; whether his attention has been called to a recent statement by the Rev. B. Gregory, preaching at the Salford Mission, to the effect that in one factory the foreman acted as bookmaker with the girls as clients; and whether, having regard to these facts, he will consider the desirableness of amending or repealing the Act.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have no information as to the particular case mentioned beyond that contained in the newspaper report which the hon. Member has been good enough to send me. The Home Office has occasionally received complaints about betting in factories, but these were before and not after the passing of the Street Betting Act. If it is the case that the practice has increased, that fact may point to the necessity of further strengthening the law, but can afford no reason for repealing the useful Act of last session.

### Passenger Traffic to America.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the number of passengers who travelled to the United States by the German passenger lines and by the English passenger lines, respectively, during each of the years 1904, 1905, and 1906, distinguishing the classes by which they travelled.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The number of passengers travelling from this country to the United States by British vessels and German vessels, respectively, were as follows: In 1904, 251,784 by British vessels and 6,408 by German vessels; in 1905, 235,251 by British vessels and 6,477 by German vessels; in 1906, 294,038 by British vessels and 7,935 by German vessels. With regard to the classes by which the passengers travelled, it is only possible to distinguish between cabin and steerage passengers. I will give these particulars in the Votes.

[The following were the particulars given in the Votes:]

Statement showing the number of passengers carried by British and German Vessels from British and Irish Ports to the United States, in each of the years 1904, 1905 and 1906, distinguishing Cabin and Steerage passengers:—

| Year. | By British Vessels. | | | By German Vessels. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Cabin. | Steerage. | Total. | Cabin. | Steerage. | Total. |
| 1904 | 29,797 | 221,987 | 251,784 | 6,366 | 42 | 6,408 |
| 1905 | 33,817 | 201,434 | 235,251 | 6,161 | 316 | 6,477 |
| 1906 | 33,258 | 260,780 | 294,038 | 7,382 | 553 | 7,935 |

### Shipping Classification.

MR FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if the ships sailing under the names of the White Star Line, the Red Star Line, the American Line, the Leyland Line, the Atlantic Transport Line, and the Dominion Line, are classed among English shipping in the Board of Trade Returns.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: In the compilation of the Shipping Returns, all vessels registered as British are classed as such. I understand that, speaking generally, the vessels of the White Star Line, Leyland Line, Atlantic Transport Line, and Dominion Line are registered as British, whilst the vessels of the Red Star Line are Belgian, and those of the

American Line partly American and partly British.

MR. FELL: Then the Returns are erroneous to this extent, as these lines are owned by Americans?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Certainly not.

### Dalmuir Level Crossing Fatality.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the character of a level crossing on the North British Railway at Dalmuir, Dumbartonshire, where an express train recently killed a child and a young man who was making a gallant attempt to rescue the child; and whether he proposes to take any steps to secure the erection of a bridge there, so as to avert further accidents.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The level crossing in question is not one at which the Board of Trade can require the erection of a bridge. I am, however, in communication with the company as to any precautions that can be taken to guard against accidents in the future.

### Butter Imports.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware of the quantity of butter imported into this country from Denmark which is not produced in that country, but imported there from Siberia; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter with a view to preventing the contravention of the Merchandise Marks Act.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: A small quantity of butter is consigned to this country from Russia *via* Danish ports. I am informed that a certain quantity of Siberian butter is also consigned from Denmark by Danish merchants, but I have no information as to the quantity which reaches the country in this way. If any evidence can be furnished that any such butter is imported here as Danish I shall be ready to give it consideration.

### Motor Speed Tests.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the Frome's Hill Climb, the speed at which some of the motors were driven, and the consequent injury to a spectator; and if the Government will see to it that, in future competitions on public roads, due regard will be paid to the provisions of the law and the safety of the public.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): My attention has been called to this case. The administration of the law relating to the use of the highway by motor cars is practically in the hands of the local police. From accounts in my possession I gather that the police were present on the occasion referred to, and that they took precautions to safeguard from danger the spectators, who were, moreover, aware that a competition was taking place. I am not myself in a position to take action in cases of this kind.

MR. CATHCART WASON asked whether, in view of the facts, the right hon. Gentleman would not consider with the Home Secretary the desirableness of stopping these trials altogether.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will communicate with my right hon. friend. My own personal view is that, except under very special conditions, and in the early morning, no speed or test trials should take place on a public thoroughfare.

### Eastern Mail Service.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether a new contract has been concluded with the Peninsular and Oriental Company for the mail service with India, China, and Australia for a period of seven years from 1st February, 1908; and, if so, will he state what are the terms of speed, and the amount of subsidy as compared with the present contract.

MR. LAIDLAW (Renfrewshire, E.): I beg also to ask the Postmaster-General what subsidy the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company are to receive for carrying the Indian mails under the new three years contract; what are the conditions regarding speed; if, when arranging the time-table for the Indian mails under the new contract, he will bear in mind the importance of providing for the arrival of the incoming mail before the departure of the outgoing; and if he will consult the chambers of commerce and trades associations in India regarding the most convenient time of departure from Bombay before concluding any arrangements.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): No new Eastern Mail Packet contract has been concluded, but, after prolonged consultations with the Secretaries of State for India and the Colonies in regard to Indian and Colonial interests, I have decided to accept provisionally a tender of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company offering to make a contract for seven years from 1st February, 1908, under which, in return for an annual subsidy of £305,000, as against the present subsidy of £340,000 a year, an accelerated service will be provided. If, as I hope, the details of the contract can be satisfactorily settled, the duration of the voyage between Brindisi and Bombay is to be reduced to eleven days six hours in each direction, between Brindisi and Shanghai to twenty-eight days six hours outwards and twenty-eight days twenty-two hours homewards, and between Brindisi and Adelaide to twenty-six days fourteen hours outwards and twenty-seven days two hours homewards. The saving of time thus to be secured is:—Between Brindisi and Bombay, eight hours both outward and homeward; between Brindisi and Shanghai, thirty-four hours outward and twenty-four homeward; between Brindisi and Adelaide, thirty-six hours outward and twenty-four homeward. The time-table of the new service will be arranged to the best advantage which circumstances permit; and the hour of departure from Bombay will of course be fixed with the concurrence of the Indian Government as the proper representative of Indian interests in the matter.

### Land Registration.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether in view of the Report of the Registrar of the Land Registry for the years 1903 to 1906, containing suggestions for the improvement of the system of land registration, by providing for the establishment of a general register of all land in England and Wales with absolute title at an early date and at a moderate cost, the Government propose to introduce legislation in order to carry such recommendations into effect.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir JOHN WALTON, Leeds, S.): I have nothing to add to the Answer I gave to a similar Question on the 6th March.† The subject is still receiving consideration.

### King's Bench Division.

MR. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University): On behalf of the right hon. Member for Dublin University, I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General if he can state the number of cases now standing for trial or hearing in the King's Bench Division; how many Judges will be available in London for the trial of such cases, having regard to the summer circuits; and whether any arrangements have been or will be made by which such cases, or the greater portion of them, may be disposed of before the long vacation.

SIR JOHN WALTON: The number of cases in the King's Bench Division now standing for trial is as follows:—Special juries, 192; common juries, 208; non-juries, 139; commercial cases, 20; Order XIV., 10; assigned actions, 3—total, 572. This is in addition to Crown Paper, Revenue Paper, and Railway Commission. The number of Judges available for the trial of these cases is as follows:—Provided none are absent from illness or otherwise, for the first fortnight, ten; the third and fourth week, nine; the fifth week, six; the sixth week, from five to seven; the seventh week, five; the eighth week, seven; the ninth week, six; and the last three days, seven. In other words, not counting Saturdays, which are devoted almost exclusively to cases under Order XIV., Rule 8, and omitting the Judge dealing with the commercial list, it would be as if there were one Judge taking special juries for seventy-eight days, one taking common juries for eighty days, and one taking non-juries for forty-seven days. The Government have fully realised the importance of taking steps to ensure that these cases shall be tried before the long vacation. Some weeks ago I communicated to the Lord Chief Justice the desire that this should be done, and informed him, with the concurrence of the Lord Chancellor and the Chancellor of the

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 793.

Exchequer, that a sufficient number of Commissioners would be appointed to go on circuit, so as to allow of such a staff of Judges relinquishing their summer circuits and remaining in town as might be adequate to the hearing and disposal of all these cases before the adjournment of the Court for the autumn recess. I have the permission of the Lord Chief Justice to say—and I read from his letter—that "in the event of an additional Judge of the King's Bench Division being appointed promptly, and a second Commissioner nominated to take a circuit, I have no doubt that, unless anything unforeseen occurs, we shall be able to dispose by the end of July of all the cases entered for trial to the middle of the present month" (May). A second Commissioner has been appointed accordingly, and more Commissioners would have been appointed if it had been desired. The creation, with the sanction of Parliament, of an additional Judge is receiving the consideration—I think I may add the favourable consideration—of the Lord Chancellor. I have before me a forecast made in an official quarter, from which it would appear that the estimate of the Lord Chief Justice with regard to the disposal of the business of the King's Bench Division may be unduly sanguine, and that one-half only of the cases can be tried between now and 1st August unless some of the Judges give up their circuits and remain in town. Whether this be so or not, I wish it to be understood that His Majesty's Government are willing to relieve the Judges of the obligation to go on circuit, and to provide the necessary expense involved in their remaining in London in order that the London lists shall be disposed of. The Government have done, and they are prepared to do, what they can to bring about the most desirable object of ensuring the trial of the causes which stand for hearing in the King's Bench Division before the long vacation, and they feel that there will be cause for much disappointment if this cannot be done. I may add, with regard to the future regulation of the business of this division and of the Court of Appeal, that the Lord Chancellor expects in a few days to announce the appointment of a Committee to consider and report upon the subject, including the question of appointing more Judges, so as to provide for the rapid despatch of business. It is not likely that there will be much delay in reporting, as the Committee will consist of persons who are familiar with this subject.

MR. RAWLINSON: What form will the Committee take?

SIR JOHN WALTON: It will be composed of gentlemen thorougly familiar with King's Bench business, who will be invited to act by the Lord Chancellor.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Will the hon. and learned Gentleman consider the desirability of employing consider the desirability of borrowing, or better still, taking over body and sleeves three or four of the Irish Judges who now have nothing to do in Ireland and employing them in England where crime seems to be on the increase?

MR. RAWLINSON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether the Government, having regard to the additional duties thrown upon the High Court by the Criminal Appeal Bill, intend to appoint any, and, if so, how many, additional Judges to the King's Bench Division of that Court.

SIR JOHN WALTON said this Question was to be considered by the Committee which the Lord Chancellor expected to appoint in a few days.

### Criminal Appeal Bill.—Staff of Director of Public Prosecutions.

MR. RAWLINSON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether the Government propose, having regard to Clause 12 of the Criminal Appeal Bill, to increase to any, and what, extent the staff of the Director of Public Prosecutions; and, if so, what estimate has been made of the cost of such increase.

SIR JOHN WALTON: The clause itself provides for such increase in the staff as may prove to be necessary. It is impossible to forecast the consequent cost to the Department until experience has shown the extent to which convicted persons avail themselves of the right to appeal.

MR. RAWLINSON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether any, and what, estimate has been made of the expenditure likely to be incurred under Clauses 12 and 13 of the Criminal Appeal Bill.

SIR JOHN WALTON: No estimate of the expenditure has been or can be made for the reason stated in the last Answer. An estimate at this stage is doubly difficult, because not only is the number of applications for leave to appeal largely speculative, but the proportion of cases in which leave will be given is uncertain. In my opinion, the proportion will be small, and the cost of consequent appeals not great.

MR. RAWLINSON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General what is the estimated expenditure necessary for carrying out the provisions of Clause 16 (2) of the Criminal Appeal Bill, differentiating between the cost of taking shorthand notes and the cost of transcribing the same respectively.

SIR JOHN WALTON: The cost of taking down in shorthand the Report of every criminal trial has not yet been estimated, but I will ascertain whether there is any difficulty in this being done. The expense cannot be large. The more important item of obtaining transcripts of the portions of such Reports which the Court may desire to see cannot be estimated at this stage for the reasons already given.

### Shetland Trawling Prosecutions.

MR. CATHCART WASON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been called to the recent trawling prosecutions and convictions in Shetland, and to the fact that fishermen have to leave home for indeterminate periods in order to give evidence; and if, under the circumstances, the Fishery Board will for the future make small grants out of any fines that might be imposed in respect of breaches of the Law to recoup the fishermen for some of their lost time.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Under existing circumstances a witness is entitled to receive 4s. 6d. for his day's attendance at court, and 3s. for every other day upon which he is prevented from following his ordinary occupation. The Fishery Board do not receive the fines imposed on the masters of trawl vessels, and, therefore, they are not in a position to consider the question of making grants from those fines to fishermen who act as witnesses.

### Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, whether the provisions of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill are intended by the Government to ensure that every existing small holding in Scotland should fall automatically, in the case of yearly tenancies on the passage of the Bill and in the case of leaseholds on the expiration of the lease, within the operation of the Bill: or whether it is intended that the tenant of any such holding should be free, if he so desires, to continue in his holding after the passage of the Bill on such terms as he may be able, without reference to the Bill, to arrange with his landlord.

MR. SINCLAIR: The operation of the Bill is intended to be as interpreted in the first portion of the hon. Member's Question; any landholder, however, is entitled upon one year's notice to his landlord to renounce his holding; and it should be borne in mind further, that Section 5 of the Crofters Holdings Act which will apply generally provides for alteration of rent by agreement between landlord and landholder.

### Crofters' Holdings.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, what are the number of holdings within the crofting area to which the Crofters Acts apply; the number of crofters who have had fair rents fixed; the number of crofters who have not availed themselves of the Acts; and the number of crofters who, after having had their rents fixed for a term of years, have subsequently preferred to return to ordinary relations with their landlords.

MR. SINCLAIR: (1) The exact number of holdings to which the Crofters' Holdings Acts apply cannot be stated, but according to the latest return (No. 127 of 1907) the number of occupiers of farms in the crofting counties entered at a rental of not exceeding £30 is 28,577. (2) The number of crofters who have had fair rents fixed is 15,156, exclusive of cases of re-valuation of holdings. (3) There is no information available as to the number of crofters who, while enjoying the statutory tenure conferred by the Act, have not thought it necessary to apply to have a fair rent fixed by the Crofters Commission; (4) There are no statistics available as to the number of crofters who have renounced the statutory tenure; it is understood that there are some instances where crofters have done so on removing to more suitable holdings, or on receiving favourable treatment at the hands of the landlord: but these cases are believed to be few in number.

### Illegal Trawling.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the number of cases of illegal trawling around the coasts of Scotland, will he consider the expediency of imposing more drastic penalties for infringments of the law.

MR. SINCLAIR: The administration of the existing law is under close observation, and the suggestion of my hon. friend's Question will be noted.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman endeavour to make the existing law applicable to foreigners?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Culloden Estate Evictions.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been called to the evictions of certain tenants on the Culloden estate, Ferintosh, Ross-shire, and of the fact that the factor or estate agent has given notice to other tenants; and will he consider the expediency of arranging in the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, now before Parliament, for crofter leaseholders to obtain the benefits of the Act directly it becomes law.

MR. SINCLAIR: My information may not be complete, but I am aware of the incidents to which my hon. friend now draws attention, and the policy of the Government in regard to leaseholders, which was adopted after careful consideration, is contained in the Bill as now before the Scottish Grand Committee.

### Dublin and Belfast Magistracy.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the head of population within the Dublin Metropolitan and Belfast magistrates' jurisdiction respectively, the number of magistrates in the two areas, and their salaries.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The estimated population of the Dublin Metropolitan Police district in the middle of 1906 was 405,000, and that of Belfast City was 366,220. There are four divisional magistrates in Dublin, of whom the chief magistrate receives a salary of £1,200 per annum, and the three others £1,000 each. There are two resident magistrates in Belfast, of whom one receives a salary of £675 with a commuted forage allowance of £100, and the other a salary of £550, with a similar allowance.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Can the right hon. Gentleman explain the disparity between the Dublin and Belfast payments, the populations being practically the same?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir. England and Ireland are full of disparities. I can give no explanation.

### Irish Land Purchase Instalments.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland the total annual amount payable by way of instalments in respect of purchases already completed under Land Purchase Acts in Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL: The total amount of annuities payable under the Land Purchase Acts is £1,354,089, and the amount of annuities under the Bright Clauses of the Act of 1870 is £11,269.

### Dublin Revaluation.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any progress has been made in the re-valuation of Dublin; and when the Commissioner of Valuation anticipates that it will be completed.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.; for Mr. RUNCIMAN): I understand that considerable progress has been made in the revaluation of the city, but the work is not sufficiently advanced to enable the Commissioners of Valuation to fix a date for its completion.

### Irish Land Purchase.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that in calculating for the purpose of the Finance Act, 1894, Section 16, the value of holdings purchased under the Irish Land Purchase Acts, the standard is fixed at twenty-five years purchase of the Poor Law Valuation, and no regard is had to the terminable annuity payable to the Land Commission; and, seeing that the effect of this practice has been to make many small holdings liable for Estate Duty which would have paid no duty had they not been purchased under the Land Acts, and in view of the necessity of affording every legal protection and immunity to the rapidly multiplying small estates in Ireland, whether he will take steps to amend the practice in question.

MR. McKENNA (for Mr. RUNCIMAN): The standard of twenty-five years purchase of the Poor Law Valuation is only used where it is less than the market value of the holding. A deduction is always allowed for the terminable annuity where the duty is calculated on the net value of the property. Under Section 16 of the Finance Act, 1894, however, the duty has to be calculated by reference to the gross value. In cases falling under this section, the deduction can, therefore, only be allowed where the estate was purchased and the charge created by some person other than the deceased. Where the purchase has been made by the deceased himself, the annuity constitutes an encumbrance which he has himself created, and its redemption value is included in the gross value of the property. Recourse to Section 16 is however only optional.

### Government Bills.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government propose to proceed with the Irish Council Bill; if so, will he state the dates on which it is intended to take the Second Reading; and whether he will grant at least a clear week for the Second Reading.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): This is the first of several Questions relating to various Government Bills, and I would ask that all of these should be put off for a week, when I can answer them all together.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): Cannot the Prime Minister give an answer, at all events in regard to the Irish Council Bill, within a shorter period than a week? There is very great public interest taken in the matter.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think it is more convenient to answer all together. It is an invidious thing to pick and choose.

The following Questions were covered by the foregoing Answer:—

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the Prime Minister when he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Irish Council Bill.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask the Prime Minister whether it is proposed to pass through this House the English Valuation Bill during the present session; and when it is proposed to introduce the Bill.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): To ask the Prime Minister whether he can mention the date upon which the Second Reading of the Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill will be the first Order of the Day.

SIR J. RANDLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): To ask the Prime Minister in what order the Government propose to take the Second Reading of the Irish Council Bill, the Resolutions respecting the House of Lords, and the introduction of the promised temperance legislation; and can he also indicate the approximate dates.

SIR FRANCIS CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): To ask the Prime Minister whether he is now in a position to state what course will be taken as to the Licensing Bill, promised in the Speech from the Throne.

### The Indian Budget.

SIR HENRY COTTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister on what date the Indian Budget will be taken.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: On Thursday, June 6th.

### Business of the House.

MR. WALTER LONG inquired from the Prime Minister whether he proposed to ask the House, supposing there was a desire to continue the discussion on the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, to sit to a late hour, and what business it was proposed to take this week.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said the business to-morrow and Wednesday would be the Army Bill, on Thursday Scottish Supply, and Friday the Criminal Appeal Bill. As to that night, they hoped to be able to take the First Reading stage of the Bill without sitting up to a very late hour.

MR. WALTER LONG pointed out that there was a private Bill down for that evening, which, there was every reason to believe, would occupy a considerable time, and he inquired whether it was quite reasonable to ask the House to conclude that night the debate on so important a measure as the Small Holdings Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN replied that the interposed Bill had been discussed already at great length, and he did not imagine that the further discussion would be very prolonged. It was very desirable to take the First Reading of the Small Holdings Bill so that Members might see the measure in print and judge of its contents.

---

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the introduction of the Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, if under discussion when the Business is postponed, be resumed and proceeded with, though opposed, after the interruption of Business."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 249; Noes, 64. (Division List No. 176.)

### AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Som'rset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hno. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, J. G.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithness-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson

Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, J. Wnyford (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W.C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm's)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Dublin, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Lord Balcarres.

## SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) [SALARIES].

Resolution reported: "That, for carrying out the provisions of any Act of the present session to encourage the formation of Small Agricultural Holdings in Scotland, it is expedient to authorise—(i.) the payment, out of the Consolidated Fund, of the salaries of the chairman and of each of the other members of the Land Court; (ii.) the payment, out of moneys provided by Parliament, of—(*a*) the salaries and remuneration of the Agricultural Commissioners and other persons appointed or employed by them and by the Land Court, and the expenses incurred by the Land Court and the Agricultural Commissioners in the execution of their duties; (*b*) an annual sum not exceeding £85,000 for the use of the Agricultural Commissioners; (*c*) compensation in certain cases to members and officers of the Crofters Commission."

Resolution read a second time.

Mr. RAWLINSON (Cambridge University) moved an Amendment to limit the expenses in respect of the Agricultural Commissioners to £3,000 a year. He said that under Section 3 of the Bill a Land Court was proposed to be set up and under Section 4 a tribunal was created called the Agricultural Commission for Scotland. The object of his Amendment was not in any way to deal with the merits of the Bill; indeed, for the purpose of his Amendment, the Bill might be assumed to be a highly desirable measure, although he did not say for one moment that that was his view, nor that it was the view of any Scottish landlord or tenant. On Friday they had been asked to draw three blank cheques for the use of the Secretary for Scotland, with possibly the assent of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That was thoroughly unsound finance, and Members of that House, who were supposed to be looking after the expenditure of the country, had no right to pass any orders of such a nature, no matter how desirable they might be. Under the Bill no limit was put upon the expenses of the Land Court at all. The Secretary for Scotland was questioned very closely on Friday as to what his estimate was of the expenditure likely to be incurred under that section of the Bill. The hon. Member for Leith Burghs made out the estimated expenditure to be a large sum; he (Mr. Rawlinson) was not concerned whether that was right or wrong, but the Secretary for Scotland entirely dissented from the hon. Member's figures and said, in reply to a request for his own, that he had something better than an estimate, he had a figure to guide him which was based on experience, and that amount was £5,000. That figure was challenged by a large number of Members, but he was quite prepared to accept it, and he had, therefore, put upon the Paper an Amendment restricting the expenses under that sub-section of the Bill to £6,000 a year, thus leaving a substantial margin beyond the figure quoted by the Secretary for Scotland. Then there was the question of the expenses of the Agricultural Commissioners. There were the salaries of the three Commissioners and the expenses the Commission might incur. In the case of the Land Court the salaries of the Judges were estimated at a sum amounting to £6,000 a year, but in the case of the Agricultural Commissioners there was no estimate at all as to the sum they were to receive. The Secretary for Scotland had been repeatedly asked what was the estimated amount for the remuneration of those three gentlemen, but he was either unable or unwilling to reply. In order, therefore, to obtain information upon this point he had put down in his Amendment that those salaries should be limited to £3,000 a year. If that was not a proper figure he would be prepared to accept any figure the Secretary of Scotland might name, but he objected to power being given to the right hon. Gentleman to appoint those officials at a cost to be borne by public funds without any control from that House over their remuneration.

The right hon. Gentleman on Friday had used words to the effect, "Oh, the House can safely give power to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, because these salaries will come up on the Estimates on some other occasion." He protested most strongly against that answer. If the House passed the Financial Resolution, and gave the Secretary for Scotland power to appoint the three Commissioners at such salaries as the right hon. Gentleman and the Chancellor of the Exchequer thought right, the House would have practically no control over the salaries. It was one thing for the House to resolve that three people should be appointed at such and such a salary—whatever the figure might be—and another thing to give authority to certain members of the Government to make the appointments, and not to take the trouble to restrict the remuneration. It should be remembered also that there was unlimited power given as to the amount of the expenses of the Commission itself. That was estimated by the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs at £100,000, an estimate which was rejected by the Secretary for Scotland. Some limit should be put on the amount. In protesting against the course which the Government were now taking, he and his friends were following the excellent precedent set by many of those who now sat on the Treasury Bench when discussing the Aliens Bill. When he found arguments marked by sound sense emanating even from hon. Members on the other side of the House he was perfectly ready to adopt them. In the case of the Aliens Bill various Members of the then Opposition argued that an estimate of the cost should be given, and the late Government did give an estimate on the authority of the Home Secretary at the time. It might or might not have been a correct one, but it was criticised. In view of the position taken up on the Aliens Bill, it was rather the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to assist the Opposition than to assist the right hon. Gentleman who sat beside him on the present occasion. He submitted that there was a principle involved in the Resolution against which the House ought to protest. It was a question involving the position of the Chancellor of the Exchequer at every turn. On Friday the Secretary for Scotland, at the end of his interesting speech, naïvely said that he did not know that he had given any information except what appeared in the Bill at the present time. It was a perfectly frank admission, and it was about correct. The Chancellor of the Exchequer came in, and, after he had been in the House for a short time, moved the closure.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): Half an hour.

Mr. RAWLINSON said that if the House passed the Resolution as it stood it would create a thoroughly bad precedent. There ought to be some limit to the cost. The new bodies to be constituted under the Bill were only to have the administration of £65,000, and as large sums had been indicated by hon. Members on both sides of the House as the possible cost, it was desirable as a matter of principle that some limit should be put on the expenditure which would be involved in the working of the measure. He begged to move.

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London), in seconding the Amendment, said he failed to understand why the Government did not accept it. The Bill provided that the chairman of the Land Court should receive a salary not exceeding £2,000 a year, and that each of the other members should receive a salary not exceeding £1,000 a year. In the case of the Agricultural Commissioners the Bill mentioned no salary. If it was possible to fix the salary for the members of the Land Court, he failed to see why it should not be done also in the case of the Agricultural Commissioners. The work of the Land Court would be far more important than that of the Agricultural Commissioners, and if £1,000 a year was sufficient for a member of that Court, why should it not be sufficient for a commissioner? His hon. and learned friend had referred to speeches which were delivered some two years ago in Opposition by right hon. and hon. Gentlemen now on the Treasury Bench; and he understood the Prime Minister to say in an interruption, "Your Government did the same thing." He was glad to hear that the example of the late Government was going to be followed by the present Government. If he could believe that the Prime Minister was going to follow the example of the late Government he could prophesy for the right hon. Gentleman an easy time, but up to the present he had not done that. He himself was in the House during the debates on the Aliens Bill, and a question exactly similar to that now before the House came up. He was very much struck by the arguments used then by hon. Gentlemen who now occupied places in the Government. He admitted that he voted with his Party, but he was not quite sure that his Party were right on that occasion. He would point out that the circumstances were very different on the two occasions. The sum of money to be applied to the purposes of this measure was very much larger than the amount applied under the Aliens Act. It was to be devoted to matters involving a greater amount of detail, and the administrative charges would, therefore, be larger. *A fortiori* it was right that the Resolution should say what sum of money should be spent on the salaries of the Agricultural Commissioners. He asked the Prime Minister whether he remembered the claims of his Party that the financial control of the House of Commons should be re-established. On that side of the House they were endeavouring to give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of fulfilling his electoral pledges. They were asking for nothing unreasonable, but only that the Secretary for Scotland should tell the House what salaries he proposed to give to the gentlemen whom he appointed as Agricultural Commissioners.

Amendment proposed—

"In Paragraph 2 (a), line 7, after the word 'Commissioners,' to insert the words 'not exceeding three thousand pounds.'" (*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said that this was the report of a Resolution adopted by the Committee of the Whole House on Friday last. It was merely an enabling resolution to empower the Committee upstairs to discuss the clauses relating to the amount of money to be spent on, and by, the Agricultural Commissioners. The House did not part with its control over expenditure when the Resolution went upstairs. The Bill would have to pass through two stages in the House before it was sent up to another place. The salaries of the members of the Land Court, which was a judicial body, were put on the Consolidated Fund, and for that reason they were not in the same position as the salaries of the Agricultural Commissioners, who would be simply a department of the Civil Service, whose salaries would be fixed in consultation with the Treasury. Therefore, those salaries would come under the review of the House on the Estimates. In adopting that course the Government were simply following the course pursued by all Governments.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) understood that the Amendment was in the direction of defining what was to be the general expenditure under the Bill. He had been much struck by the proposed financial arrangements. He did not believe that the machinery of the Bill could be carried out at a less expense than £10,000 per annum, and that was to administer an expenditure of £100,000. He thought that that was extravagant in the highest degree and a bad precedent to set up. The salaries for the members of the Land Court were £2,000 for the chairman and £4,000 for the other members. But that was not all——

*MR. SPEAKER said that the Amendment did not refer to the Land Court at all, but to the Agricultural Commissioners.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said that what he wanted to know was, what were the actual salaries to be paid to the Agricultural Commissioners.

*MR. SPEAKER said that the right hon. Gentleman had not followed the Amendment moved by the hon. and learned Member for Cambridge University.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) thought that before the House passed the Resolution they should understand what the position really was. They were being asked to vote a certain sum of money for the salaries of the three gentlemen who were to constitute the Agricultural Commission. The Secretary for Scotland had said that these Commissioners were to be ordinary civil servants, and that the ordinary Civil Service procedure would be followed in regard to them. But the right hon. Gentleman had not pointed out that these Commissioners were not ordinary civil servants; they were to be appointed for an extraordinary purpose—to administer what was nothing short of a revolution in the land system of Scotland. What the people of Scotland wanted was to obtain from the right hon. Gentleman some estimate of the total cost of the Bill and what the salaries of the Agricultural Commissioners were to be. Those Agricultural Commissioners were to be responsible for preparing and creating small holdings, to take over the powers and duties of the Congested Districts Board, to have some of the powers of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, and so on. They could not expect any man to do those duties for £1,000 a year. He supported the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 57; Noes, 256. (Division List No. 177.)

## AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cecil,Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A(Worc.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm)
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig,Captain James (Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey,F.W.F(Bury S.Edm'ds)
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver,Sir Lewis(Edinburgh,W
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rothschild,Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir Frederick Banbury and Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.

## NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Som'rs't)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H(Essex,Romf'rd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough. William
Coats,Sir T. Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,SirWm.J(S.Pancras,W.)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson,W.H (St.Pancras,N.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of

Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L (Caithn'ss-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barrett, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N (Doncast'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro')
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon.
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E)
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampt'n)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. RAWLINSON said the Amendment he now proposed to move had reference to the expenses of the Land Court. That Court, as the House was aware, was dealt with in two clauses; the first was concerned with the salaries of the judges, amounting to £6,000 a year. The second clause had reference to the salaries and expenses of the other officials and the other expenses of the Land Court, and did not propose any limitation. The Amendment he proposed placed upon those expenses a limit of £6,000 a year. He had nothing upon which to base that estimate except the statements made by the Secretary for Scotland in regard to the cost of the Crofters Commission. If he was told that that was not the correct figure, as he had said in the case of the last Amendment, he would be perfectly prepared to accept any reasonable sum. The Secretary for Scotland seemed to indicate that the sum they ought to keep in their minds was some £4,500 or £5,000 as the extra cost of the Land Court, and for that reason he had fixed £6,000 in order to allow a small margin. The Government ought to have some sort of idea of the expenditure of the suggested Land Court, and the House ought not to give a blank cheque to the right hon. Gentleman to create any number of Commissioners that he thought proper.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities), in seconding the Amendment, wished to point out one or two considerations which should serve to guide them as to the expenditure which should be incurred. He thought that the moment the Secretary for Scotland looked at the figures which he wished to bring forward he would see that his estimate of last Friday was inadequate. The right hon. Gentleman mentioned the cost of the Crofters Commission as a guide. That body dealt with a very small portion of Scotland, and therefore with but a very small fragment of the question with which the Land Court would have to deal. The questions entrusted to the Crofters Commission did not call for such prolonged consideration as would be necessary in regard to cases brought before the Land Court. What precedent could they get to guide them to some extent as to the total cost of the Land Court? The Land Court in Scotland would do work in about the same area as the Land Commission in Ireland, and the latter cost £146,000 a year. Was there any reason why they should distinguish between the Scottish Land Court and the Irish Commissioners and come to the conclusion that what cost £146,000 a year in Ireland was to be carried out for £6,000 or £7,000 in Scotland? If there was any reason for doing so, surely the right hon. Gentleman might state it to the House. The expenditure now proposed was, in his judgment, totally inadequate.

Amendment proposed—

"In paragraph 2 (a), line 10, at the end, to insert the words, 'Provided that the expense in connection with the Land Court shall not exceed £6,000 in any one year, and,'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said he was sure that hon. Gentlemen opposite would not accuse him of any desire to withhold information in regard to any part of the Bill, but he earnestly hoped that when they reconsidered the very unprecedented proposition which they were making they would not insist on dividing the House upon it. The hon. Members who moved and seconded had alluded to an estimate which he was said to have made in debate; but he had made no estimate whatever of the probable expenditure upon the Land Court, although he did mention in the course of debate what the Crofters Commission had cost annually, and added that an estimate founded upon that would be more likely to be correct than any founded on the expenditure of the Irish Land Commission. At present, however, any estimate on the subject was likely to be incorrect, because they had not defined the powers and duties of the body to be set up. It would therefore at that stage be most improper to attempt to define the cost, and it would be a waste of the time of the House to endeavour to do so. It was impossible to define the cost of any system of administration until one had defined the way in which that administration was to be carried out. All the expenses of the Land Court, except those placed upon the Consolidated Fund, would come on the Votes, and be submitted annually to Parliament, and there would be the strictest financial control that the rules of Parliament allowed. He asked the House, therefore, to consider whether it was necessary to continue the discussion on this trivial point.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.) said the right hon. Gentleman had referred to the fact that the Bill was to be considered upstairs, and had expressed the opinion that the procedure adopted by his hon. friend in moving the Amendment was quite unusual. It was not the procedure but the character of the Bill that was unusual. The right hon. Gentleman, when making that remark, had quite forgotten that the discussion upstairs would be a discussion of which neither those interested nor the public would have any record or know what was being done. With regard to the Bill itself, the right hon. Gentleman had made statements which were simply amazing. He had said it was impossible to make any estimate, because until the Bill had been discussed upstairs the functions of the proposed body were undefined. Surely the Government had arrived at some idea as to what the functions of that body would be, and in that case they must have some idea of what expense would be involved. The right hon. Gentleman objected to what he termed narrowing down the issues in this manner, but his hon. friend who moved the Amendment would adopt any reasonable suggestion the Government might make. As the matter at present stood, they were going to discuss the Bill in Committee without knowing anything of the Government's intentions with regard to it, and they would debate these questions under conditions which would not permit of those in the country who were interested — and they were many, and they were not all interested in the manner the Government thought they were—knowing what took place. That there was a very general interest in the question was shown by the fact that, although he was not a Scottish Member, as a member of the Committee he had received numerous letters showing a very lively interest in the Bill. It was simply amazing that the Government should come forward with revolutionary proposals of this kind, and then say they could not form any estimate of what the cost would be. It would only add enormously to the difficulties under which they were to discuss the Bill in Committee upstairs, and he did not think the Government were taking the right steps to facilitate the passage of their Bill.

SIR F. BANBURY said the Secretary for Scotland in his reply to the Amendment had said, first, that the expense would be discussed in Committee of Supply, and, secondly, that it was quite unusual for a Member of the House to move an Amendment of the kind now proposed. With regard to the latter statement, he might point out that the supporters of the Government in 1904 made an exactly similar proposal, as the President of the Board of Trade moved to add the words "in any one year not to exceed £5,000;" whilst in 1905 the hon. Member for Halifax moved a precisely similar Amendment. With regard to the right hon. Gentleman's first answer, he might say that there would be no Committee of Supply until May or June, 1908, and in the meantime the Government were asking the House to vote money for an expenditure as to the extent of which they had no idea. He believed he was right in saying that unless that Resolution was passed no money could be spent under the Bill. If by its being discussed upstairs the right hon. Gentleman meant that he was going to inform the Committee what money was to be spent, why could he not inform the House now? If the right hon. Gentleman knew what was going to be spent, there was no reason for his silence. The real truth was that the right hon. Gentleman could not accept the Amendment because he had not the vaguest idea of what amount he was going to spend.

*MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) expressed the opinion that the right hon. Gentleman was himself largely responsible for the Amendment, because he had intimated that the expenditure upon the Land Court would be analogous to the expenditure on the administration of the Crofters Commission. Anything more ludicrous it was impossible to conceive. The expenditure of the Crofters Commission in its earlier years varied between £8,800 and £9,900 a year, and the variety and complexity of the duties the Land Court would have to perform were not comparable to the comparatively restricted work of the Crofters Commission. It almost convinced him that those behind this Bill knew very little about the subject. A short time ago they were told at Edinburgh that the Government had most carefully considered every detail connected with the Bill. If that was the case it was surely possible for the right hon. Gentleman, without binding himself to any specific estimate, to give the House some idea of what he thought would be the cost of carrying out the Bill. The hon. Member for Leith Burghs put it at £20,000 a year, but they did not know if that was so, and he himself would put it at a higher figure. The present was the only opportunity they would have of showing the people of Scotland that they would have to pay for something they did not want. He would vote for the Amendment as a protest against the failure to give the information asked for.

MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor) said the expense of the machinery of the Bill seemed to him to be out of all proportion to the work to be performed. Apparently the machinery was going to cost 20 per cent of the whole of the money expended. The amount of money to be expended was sufficient to set up about 100 small holders a year, and the work involved in that was so small that the cost of administration seemed to be out of all proportion. The whole sum at the disposal of the Commissioners was so small as practically to make the Bill, if it passed, inoperative. The right hon. Gentleman had said that there were now about 38,000 crofters who came under the Crofters Acts, and at the rate of 100 small holdings a year they might hope, with luck, to double the number of small holders in Scotland in 285 years. Under these circumstances he could not help thinking that the Government were offering to the people of Scotland a phantom and nothing more. He should, therefore, vote for the Amendment.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said the right hon. Gentleman had already given one estimate, for he had pointed out that the £20,000 suggested by the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs was too much, and that in his opinion the estimate of £5,000 based upon the expenditure of the Crofters Commission was nearer the mark. Had the right hon. Gentleman considered that the expenditure on the Land Court would range between the wide margin of £5,000 to £20,000? In arriving at the estimate of about £5,000, did the right hon. Gentleman include the work done by the Land Court in fixing the compensation to be paid, according to the statement of the Prime Minister, where the landlords incurred a loss? In the second place, was the cost included of fixing fair rents for crofters and small holders who were not in the original Bill, and to whose case, he understood, the right hon. Gentleman was going to give favourable consideration?

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said he would call attention to an answer which the right hon. Gentleman had given. He had pointed out to him the other day the cost of a similar Land Commission set up in Ireland in 1881—a Commission very similar to the Crofters Commission under the Crofters Act of 1886, except that the power of free sale was included. He had pointed out to the right hon. Gentleman that the cost of the Land Commission in Ireland in 1883 rose as high as £92,000, and he had asked him what particular items should be cut off from that cost in framing the estimate of the cost of the Land Court under this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had replied that in his view that sum of £92,000 could not be reached by the proposed Land Court. He had thereupon reminded the Secretary for Scotland that if the cost were halved it would be £46,000, or, if quartered, about £22,000. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the annual expenditure of the Crofters Commission was about £5,000, and that that would probably be about the expenditure of the Land Court. Had the right hon. Gentleman considered what the Crofters Commission had cost? It had been in operation for some years, and it was only during recent years that the annual expenditure had been about £5,000. In 1889–90 the cost of the Crofters Commission rose to nearly £10,000 a year. There were some 28,000 crofters holdings in Scotland, of which 15,000 had had their rents fixed. It was not merely crofters holdings but small holdings with which the present Bill would deal. There were 62,000 small holdings in Scotland paying a rent of under £50 a year, and he submitted that the figures under the Crofters Act would be doubled, especially when they remembered that in fixing 15,000 rents the expenditure had risen to £10,000 a year. He submitted that the right hon. Gentleman was not treating the House with that confidence which ought to be reposed in it. Why could he not give a clear estimate? Either he did not know or he would not say. Had not the right hon. Gentleman had a consultation on the documents which had passed between him and the

Chancellor of the Exchequer, in order to form some kind of estimate as to what was to be the cost of the Land Court? That was the only opportunity they had of discussing the financial question. It had been said that they could discuss it in Committee upstairs, but the Chairman of the Committee might very naturally say that they should have discussed it downstairs on the financial Resolution and rule them out of order. Therefore, he urged that now was the time for the right hon. Gentleman to give them an estimate. It was not only Members for Scottish constituencies who were interested, but also Members who represented English constituencies, who had a right to know to what they were committing themselves. They at any rate would get no benefit from the expenditure; indeed, they were in a better position, because there would not be that detriment to agriculture in England which would be experienced in Scotland if this Bill were passed. Could not the right hon. Gentleman now, even at the last moment, take the House more into his confidence, and give them a statement less vague and unintelligible than that which he had put before them on Friday?

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said he had hesitated to rise, in the hope that they would receive an answer from the right hon. Gentleman. The Members of that House would not all be on the Committee upstairs, and they desired to know what would be the amount of expenditure under the provisions of the Bill. They had already heard that the Land Court was to cost £6,000 for the remuneration of its chairman and four members; but did the House understand that the Land Court was to have power, with the sanction of the Secretary for Scotland, to appoint assessors, surveyors, land agents, valuers, principal clerks, clerks, messengers and other officers? He did not know on what scale the salaries of those officials were to be paid, but common sense told them that they would be fairly high; and when they added the amount of those salaries to the £6,000 for the Commissioners, the sum would be a very large percentage of the total amount provided under the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had made an almost piteous appeal to them to leave these matters to be discussed until they saw what was put upon the Votes; but by far the better way would be for the right hon. Gentleman to take a maximum sum—after consultation with those who advised him—and put that upon the Vote. If it was found not to be sufficient, they would not be hard upon him when the discussion came on in Committee of Supply; they would be perfectly ready to understand that the cost of assessors, surveyors, valuers, principal clerks, and messengers was larger than had been expected, and that, therefore, the estimate required to be enlarged. That would be a fair way of treating the House. Would any hon. Gentleman dealing privately with an estate, and entering upon negotiations of this character, be content to leave the question of cost open in the manner here proposed? If assessors, surveyors, and valuers were to be appointed, any hon. Member of the House acting privately would form, at all events, a rough estimate of what he was going to pay. Why should not the Government follow the same course? Instead of that, however, the House were met with a blank refusal, and told that they must wait and then pay. It seemed to him that there was very little interest taken in the Bill in Scotland, except among a number of people who hoped to be assessors, valuers, surveyors, or clerks, and he would like to see the expenditure on that class limited. He desired to see a fair and reasonable maximum put down.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said there were two questions of great importance raised by the Amendment before the House. One was whether any limit should be put on the expenditure to be incurred under the Bill. The second was whether the limit proposed by his hon. and learned friend was a satisfactory one as regarded the particular portion of the Bill to which he had allocated it. He regretted that owing, he presumed, to public business, it had not been possible for either the Prime Minister or the Chancellor of the Exchequer to be present during any part of the discussion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was in an especial sense the guardian of the public purse, and the right hon. Gentleman was, also in an especial sense, the father, godfather, and sponsor of the new Rules of procedure. The House would observe the way in which the new procedure Rule was being worked. He took a good deal of interest in the discussion on that Rule, and did his best to ascertain the reason which lay behind its adoption by the Government. In that discussion the Government asserted that they attached great importance to the financial regulations, which they said would preserve the control of the House over financial matters even in the case of Bills which were sent upstairs. His hon. friends had asked for some reasonable estimate of the expenditure involved by the measure to which the Resolution under discussion referred, and the Secretary for Scotland had informed the House that he was unable to give any estimate because he did not know what the Committee upstairs would do. Where did the control of the House come in? Under those circumstances what a farce was that discussion of the Resolution. What became of the alleged safeguard against extravagance or malversation of public money? Already, almost in the case of their first Bill, the Government were deliberately breaking down the practice which they advocated and defended when they induced the House to pass the new procedure Rules. The Government were deliberately refusing the information without which the discussion of the Resolution must be futile, and they were doing so on the plea that the new Committee upstairs put it out of their power to give any estimate. They had a right to know from the Secretary for Scotland or the Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the Government's estimate of the cost of working the Bill as it stood. There must be such an estimate in existence, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Treasury would not have concurred in the Bill without having an estimate before them. Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer give to the House the estimate given to him by the Scottish Office, and if not, would he defend his refusal? One of his hon. friends had referred to the discussion on the Aliens Bill in 1905, when a similar Amendment was moved. It was true that the late Government refused to accept that Motion which proposed to limit the expenditure under the Act to £10,000, but they did give an estimate of what the cost of the working of the Act was likely to be. In spite of that the Opposition pressed their Amendment to define and limit the sum mentioned in the Resolution, and conspicuous amongst those who voted for that Amendment were the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Secretary for Scotland. If the Government had no regard to the appeal of the Opposition, or to what they themselves had stated on the procedure Resolution, they might have some regard for consistency in regard to their votes.

MR. ASQUITH said the right hon. Gentleman had made some reference to his absence from the debate. He was inclined to think that he had attended more of the debates than the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire himself. He had never in the whole of his Parliamentary experience heard so much made of such a very small matter. What was the Amendment? The Resolution did not refer to the general expenses under the Bill or the expenses of the Land Commission. It did not refer to the salaries of the Land Commissioners or the Agricultural Commissioners, but simply to the subordinate officials of the Land Court. To say that a great constitutional question was involved because they were not prepared to say how many hundreds of pounds they were likely to spend upon subordinate officials was absurd. He was not ashamed to admit that he was not in a position to say what those expenses would be. All the Resolution did was to empower the Committee upstairs to allow such expenses. Never in the experience of the House had any such Amendment as that before the House been adopted to any financial Resolution. He challenged the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer to produce one single instance in which a limiting Amendment of the kind had been allowed to control the discretion of a Committee upstairs and ultimately the House to assign to a body of the kind here proposed an adequate staff. He was still more surprised when he heard the right hon. Gentleman quote as a precedent the Aliens Bill. It was true the Opposition of that day voted in favour of an Amendment, but they also voted to negative the Resolution, because they believed that the policy of the whole Bill was bad. On that occasion the right hon. Member for Dundee pressed for an estimate of the cost and the number of additional officers who would be required in London to look after the importation of these aliens, but the late Home Secretary replied that it was quite impossible to give any detailed estimate of the expenditure until the Bill had passed through Committee and had assumed its final shape, and until they knew what they would have to provide for.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said they had asked for an estimate, and he would be perfectly satisfied if the right hon. Gentleman gave the House that information, and he would not press for the details. He intended to vote for the Amendment if they got no estimate. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had omitted to inform the House that in the debate on the Aliens Bill the late Home Secretary gave the kind of estimate for which the Opposition were now asking.

MR. ASQUITH: No, he did not give such an estimate at all.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) said they were all very anxious to see small holders prosperous, and therefore they ought to take care that their proportion of the expense of the working of the Act would not make the measure a delusion and a fraud. They had had experience of a similar nature on other Boards, and if £20,000 was going to the Crofters Commission it seemed to him that they should take some step to see that the whole of the balance was not swallowed up by judges and assessors and so on. He thought the Labourers Act in Ireland was a very fair parallel, and in that instance, from the very beginning, the expenses of carrying out the Act had been out of all proportion to the benefit that had accrued to the labourers. He hoped that under this Bill they would not fall into the same mistakes as they had done in Ireland. Over and over again it had been urged that something should be done to limit the expenses connected with small holdings. Here they were erecting costly machinery, and those in charge of the Bill could give no estimate whatever of what the cost would be. The Chancellor of the Exchequer should give an assurance that a certain proportion of the money voted each year would go to the actual working of the Act, and that the money would not be swallowed up by excessive salaries, which, in the case of Ireland, had been intolerably unjust for years past. The experience of hon. Members from Ireland was much larger in this matter than that of the Secretary for Scotland, and if the right hon. Gentleman would only communicate with the officials of the Irish Office—not the newly imported officials, but those who had been at work there for some time—he would be able to take a reasonable view of the Bill. The position of the right hon. Gentleman would be much stronger in the Committee upstairs if he could show that the Government were most anxious that the expenses in connection with the officials should not be excessive and that the class they desired to help by small holdings should concerned in benefit to the greatest possible extent.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 79; Noes, 274. (Division List No. 178).

AYES.

Acland-Hood, RtHn. SirAlex F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds

Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Younger and Sir Henry Craik.

## NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hon Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon
Billson, Afred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L (Caithn'ss-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Howard, John Geoffrey
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kilbride, Denis
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.

Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Mara, James
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H (Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John(Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

MR. RAWLINSON moved to insert in paragraph 2 (a), line 10, the words, "Provided that the expenses in connection with the Agricultural Commissioners shall not exceed £5,000." The expenditure under the Bill might be £85,000, but he would assume that it would be only £65,000 a year. Under the Amendment he had allowed £20,000 for working expenses, and he submitted that that would be an ample margin to allow for the purpose. He was doubtful whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer understood the previous Amendment. It was a question not merely of the salaries of the subordinate officials, but of the whole of the salaries to be paid under the powers given by the Bill. In reply to the right hon. Gentleman's suggestion that it was an unusual course to move such an Amendment, he would point out that that was the only way of raising effectively a discussion on the financial clauses. There were precedents in 1904 and 1905. In the discussion on the Aliens Bill [Expenses] Resolution on 8th June, 1904, the hon. Member for Halifax

"objected to the Resolution being passed without some explanation. The Committee had a blank cheque presented to them which they were to sign without the least indication of the expense that would attend the working of the Aliens Bill. A good deal depended upon the cost of working the measure. There ought to be an estimate of the number of officials to be appointed. After what had happened in recent years the Committee could put no faith in Treasury supervision. Treasury control had become quite a myth in latter days."

*MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. and learned Member was going over the whole ground again and repeating exactly the same arguments. The only thing permissible to the hon. and learned Member was to show in what respect the Amendment he now proposed to move differed from the last.

MR. RAWLINSON said he bowed to Mr. Speaker's ruling; but was sorry that he had not the opportunity of reading on the last Amendment the extract which he now quoted. They were dealing on this particular Amendment, not with the salaries of the members of the Land Court, but with the general expenses of the Agricultural Commissioners; and the same arguments which be laid before the House in regard to the Land Court applied with redoubled force in regard to the general expenses of the Agricultural Commissioners. The power of expenditure by the Agricultural Commissioners ought to be limited most carefully, because their operations covered a wider field. He submitted that there was nothing in the circumstances to justify them in delegating the powers of the House to the Commissioners or in trusting to the control of the Treasury. He begged to move.

SIR F. BANBURY seconded the Amendment. No argument had come from the Front Treasury Bench against the Amendment, and the Opposition were only doing their duty in pressing it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the last Amendment dealt only with the salaries of a few clerks; but this Amendment dealt with all the expenses connected with the Agricultural Commissioners, and they were entitled to ask that a sum should be named in the Bill.

Amendment proposed—

"In paragraph 2 (a), line 10, at the end, to insert the words 'Provided that the expenses in connection with the Agricultural Commissioners shall not exceed five thousand pounds.'"—(*Mr. Rawlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SINCLAIR said that the Amendment proposed to limit the expenditure of the Agricultural Commission. But the Agricultural Commission would be simply a Department of the Civil Service; and it was quite unusual to put any sum in such a Resolution as was now before the House limiting the expenditure of an administrative Department. He repeated that Parliament retained the whole control over that expenditure through the Estimates.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs) rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 273; Noes, 80. (Division List No. 179.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hon Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth,R.L (Caithn'ss-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Aflred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras, E.
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W.H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Lleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncaster
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,RobertJohn (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Linclon)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmarthn
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(City Lond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.)
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Coates,E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birmingh'm
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.

Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (BuryS Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Wenry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir HenrySeymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants. Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
Londsale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, SirBerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Question put accordingly, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:—Ayes, 83; Noes, 275. (Division List No. 180.)

## AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. SirAlex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, RtHn. A. J. (CityLond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. SirEdw. H.
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. VictorC. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, LordR. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingham
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, CaptainJames (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (BuryS. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, SirHenrySeymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. CharlesW. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, SirLewis (Edinburgh, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, JohnFrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquaharson
Rothschild, Hon. LionelWalter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, SirBerkeleyGeorgeD.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Major Major Anstruther-Gray and Mr. Mitchell-Thomson.

## NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hon. HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (IsleofWight)
Barker, John
Barlow, JohnEmmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, HilaireJoseph Peter R.
Benn, W. (T'w'rHamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, SirJ. H (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. E. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.

Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan]
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan-Hereford, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.

Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthen
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN claimed "That the main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided:—Ayes, 275; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 181.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, W. (T'w'r H'mlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Pechkam)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinstd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazelton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Col. Ivor (Mon. S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.

Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs, Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robt. John (Norfolk, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mptn
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Colligs, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingham
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H.B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh, W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

## SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS.

*THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (MR. HARCOURT, Lancashire, Rossendale), in asking leave to introduce a Bill to amend the law relating to small holdings and allotments, said: Last year I received my baptism of fire—a kindly fire, I admit—in the introduction and conduct of a small but, as it subsequently appeared, highly contentious measure. I trust that on this occasion I shall be more fortunate, because the Bill which I ask the leave of the House to introduce is one from which I cannot think there will be any serious dissent. As to the main object and intention of the Bill, and even as to the method and machinery adopted, I hope there will be no acute differences; or that, if they do arise, they will not develop along the ordinary lines of Party cleavage. The Bill is mainly an extension, cheapening, and acceleration of the machinery for providing small holdings and allotments in England and Wales. It is drafted in the form of an Amendment to our existing law. I am quite aware that legislation by amendment and reference is not the most convenient method for those who have to consult and administer the law, but it is a method which, by common consent, every Government has been driven to adopt in recent years, and it is a method which has a supporter and defender in the Leader of the Opposition on grounds of convenience, though not, perhaps, on grounds of style. But when this Bill passes into law, I see no reason why it should not be immediately followed by a codifying Bill which will gather up all the remnants of past legislation on this subject, and set them out in as intelligible a form as an Act of Parliament can ever assume to the lay mind. The consideration of the principle of the Bill, as illustrated by its method, is rightly deferred till the Second Reading stage, and all that is required on introduction is such a sketch of the intention and the machinery as will assure the House that they may safely consider it at a later stage. I will give that sketch in the simplest terms, shorn of all legal and technical phraseology, which will convey an intelligible impression of the measure as a whole. I recollect that in regard to many measures which I have heard introduced into this House the mover has sometimes thought it necessary, as a preliminary, to establish the argumentative necessity for his proposals. I hardly think that such a course can be necessary on this occasion and on this subject. The provision of small holdings and allotments has been for many years an aspiration common to both Parties in the State, and on that ground there ought to be no political differences between us, unless it is a happy rivalry between these Benches and those as to who can contribute most to the success of the matter. Neither is it necessary for me to discuss the reason for the partial failure of former Bills on this subject. Some will think that it is due to absence of demand for the land. Others will think that the failure has arisen from the timidity and insufficiency of the proposals hitherto put forward. But neither of those parties would say that the object at which we aim is undesirable; and therefore we may set out with that amount of initial and valuable unanimity. That there has been a grave depopulation of our country districts no one will for a moment attempt to deny. Again, there may be differences as to the causes of that depopulation. Whether the music hall and the evening paper have been the magnet of the towns, or whether the lack of opportunity for advancement and independence has been the expulsive force from the villages, I will not now discuss, and perhaps I am not qualified to determine. But that depopulation has been bad for the country and that over-population has been bad for the towns no one will attempt to dispute. The physical degeneration which accompanies and which, in my opinion, is caused by urban poverty is too sadly patent to us not only in the pages of Blue-books, but in every experience of our daily life. If this or any other measure can stay the townward stream of humanity, it is worth trying at any cost. I am not so sanguine myself as to believe that Parliamentary interference will turn back to the villages any great proportion of those who have tasted or acquired a taste for the excitements of the towns. But if we can fix upon the land those who are now living on it or near it, and if we can provide an opening, a career, for those about to be born on the land, we can have no cause to regret any labour devoted to such an end. In framing this Bill we derived great guidance and advantage from the Report of the Committee of 1905, which is known as Lord Onslow's Committee, and we have derived still more advantage from the valuable evidence which that Committee received and recorded. But we have not felt ourselves bound or able to follow precisely the methods they recommended. Our Bill leaves the Small Holdings Act of 1892 untouched as regards the sale of land to the small holder. We leave those provisions for what they are worth, unless, in some cases, and I think in the future they will be rarer, there is a real or a reasonable demand for the absolute ownership of the small holdings by the occupiers; but we do nothing to facilitate that Act. We do not wish and we do not think it necessary absolutely to prohibit it. We have no desire ourselves to set up in England and Wales a class of small owners who are indebted for their ownership to the State and to the intervention of the credit of the State. If the State desires, as I think it rightly desires, a further intensive cultivation of agricultural land, it is obviously unsound that you should allow those whom you have assisted to sell their newly-acquired property, the moment they have secured the fee-simple, for a profit which, in my opinion, is not rightly theirs, and possibly for commercial and other uses, far removed from those of agriculture, to which it was intended to be devoted. Nor do we think it desirable, in a part of the kingdom where nothing of the kind exists, to create a class of limited freeholders. We have decided that the class which we aim at creating is that of occupying, cultivating tenants, but tenants of a public authority, and, by the very terms of their tenancy, deriving the sufficient security of tenure which arises or accrues from the absence of the caprice of treatment which is sometimes associated with the action of individual landlords. But, speaking of security of tenure, I want it to be clearly understood that we do not set up in England, where it has hitherto been unknown, any system of dual ownership, nor do we create such a statutory security of tenure as would confer on the occupiers any saleable tenant-right. We proceed upon the assumption that the existing local authorities, the borough and county councils, are the most convenient bodies to provide and to manage small holdings where they are willing or can be induced to do so. In the event of their default, action will be taken to this end by Commissioners appointed under the Board of Agriculture. We do not set up an outside and independent Commission, but we take powers to appoint two or more Commissioners, with Sub-Commissioners and other officers, who will be subject to the review and control of Parliament, by which their salaries will be voted, and the Government of the day, through the Minister of Agriculture, will be directly responsible for their proceedings. These Commissioners will have wide powers of inquiry as to the demand for, and the practicability of, small holdings and allotments, in any and every county in England and Wales. They will consider any schemes put forward by the local authority. In default of such schemes, they will provide them themselves. If no scheme is carried out by the local authority, the Commissioners will have power to act *proprio motu* for the acquisition of land for small holdings. They may set up independent advisory and managing committees in any district they choose, and they will charge any expenses so incurred against the defaulting county councils. Where a scheme has been prepared by the Commissioners or by the local authority, a local inquiry will be held at which all those who are concerned may be heard; and after these and other preliminaries, and after the scheme has been approved by the Board of Agriculture, the county council will proceed to acquire the necessary land. Hereafter I will speak only of the county council; but the House will remember when I do so that every act authorised to be done by a county council may be done by the Commissioners under the Board of Agriculture where a county council is in default. The county council will be empowered by the Board to acquire land for small holdings either by purchase or on lease, either by agreement or by compulsion. When the land is taken on lease it must be taken for a period of not less than fourteen years and not more than thirty-five years, but that lease can be renewed on expiration, not necessarily at the same rent, but without any increase of rent arising solely from the improvements which have been made during that lease by the county council or their tenants. In fixing the price of land purchased, or the rent of land hired, an arbitrator will be appointed by the Board of Agriculture. He will be instructed to make no addition to the price on the ground that the land has been taken compulsorily. Under the provisions for leasing the landlord will be given powers to resume possession of all or any part of the land leased at any time that he may require it for industrial or building purposes other than those of agriculture. This provision is of considerable importance in regard to land adjacent to towns. It will enable such lands to be hired, for a period at all events, at its fair, present agricultural rent, without any addition for prospective value. It is specially provided in the Bill that, in fixing the rent, no allowance is to be made for prospective use being a use for which the landlord is entitled to resume possession. Powers are given in the Bill to limited owners and tenants-for-life to dispose of their land for these purposes as if they were the absolute owners in fee simple, and I hope that this may free a certain amount of land which is not now available, or, if it is, only with a good deal of cost and difficulty. There is, of course, a saving clause for the immunity of parks, gardens, and pleasure grounds, and for the amenity and convenience of dwelling-houses; and there is a special instruction inserted that regard should be had, in taking land compulsorily, to the quantity of land owned or held by the landlord or tenant, to the convenience of other properties occupied by them, and to the avoidance, so far as practicable, of taking any undue or inconvenient amount of land from any one owner or tenant. Small holdings are defined in the Bill as holdings which exceed five acres, but which do not exceed fifty acres, or, if they do exceed fifty acres, do not exceed the annual value of £50. Up to the moment at which the county council is in a position to complete the purchase or hiring of land as if from a willing seller by agreement, the Board of Agriculture will have power, where in their discretion they think it desirable, to pay all or part of the preliminary cost of the scheme—by preliminary cost I mean the inquiry, the report, and the arbitration—in order that the rent which will fall subsequently on the tenant may not be overburdened by these charges. We who regard the provision of small holdings as a great national service think it is only reasonable and just, where the necessity may arise, that the State should contribute this amount to the cost of the machinery by which they are to be obtained. But let the House clearly understand that there is nothing in this proposal in the nature of a charity rent, nor is there going to be any contribution to rent out of local rates. From the moment that the county council is in a position to complete the purchase or the hiring, all the expense of purchase, of equipment, and of management must be treated as a whole in assessing the new rent. The county council is to be permitted to raise the necessary funds for purchase by a loan or loans, and the term of repayment for such loans is to be extended to eighty years. But the whole of the interest and sinking fund of the moneys so expended must be met by the tenants out of their rent, and, owing to the cheapness of money arising from State credit and local security, I am convinced that the rent so charged will be as low as any which could otherwise have been obtained. I pass for one moment from small holdings to tell the House the modifications and amendments which we propose in various Acts dealing with allotments. In large parts of the country where allotments do not at present exist, or, if they do exist, only in quite insufficient quantities, I have no doubt myself that the gradual development of small holdings will most easily and most economically take place through the initial medium of allotments. For this purpose we raise the definition of an allotment from one to five acres. Some hon. Members may ask why keep the distinction between the two classes of holdings at all? I think there is a very sufficient and a very real reason for maintaining it. It has always been assumed that the provision of allotments was the duty of some smaller local body than the council for the whole county. In the Act of 1887 the sanitary authority was selected. Later on the rural district council and the parish council were given different powers to that end. We now propose to substitute as the active allotment authority the parish council only, or, where there is no parish council, the chairman of the parish meeting with the overseers. We give to the parish council, subject, of course, to the consent of the county council, which is the rating authority, compulsory powers for the acquisition, by purchase or by hiring, of land for these allotments, and we transfer to the parish council all the allotments—they are not a very large number—at present held by the rural district council.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: To the parish council?

Mr. HARCOURT: Yes. They have already compulsory powers, but we give them the power to hire. By this amendment we shall enlarge the power of initiative and of management of the body which above all others has the most detailed and accurate knowledge of the wants of the village, the capabilities of the land, and the industry and fitness of the applicants. I have now stated the main lines of the Bill with regard to small holdings and allotments, but there are certain general provisions on which it is right the House should be informed. Permission is given to two county councils to combine in a scheme which will be of value in districts contiguous to the county boundary. A county council is permitted to acquire grazing and sheep walks for attachment to small holdings in common. The county council are empowered to transfer land they have acquired to associations formed for the promotion of small holdings, subject, of course, to their constitution and their rules being approved by the Board of Agriculture. The Board of Agriculture itself is permitted, if it thinks wise, in any district to set up some experimental small holdings in order to demonstrate their feasibility. That is a recommendation of Lord Onslow's Committee. But in doing so the Board of Agriculture must acquire the land by agreement and not by compulsion, and it must pay any expense which it incurs in that direction out of its own fund. The Board of Agriculture will open a small holdings account at the Bank of England, and for the first year the Treasury will contribute to that fund £100,000. The small holdings account of the Board will be audited in the usual way, and be submitted annually to Parliament. But what is more important, I think, an annual report will be made, not only by the Board of Agriculture and their Commissioners, but by all the local authorities as to what is being done in regard to small holdings and allotments. We shall, therefore, be able in this House to judge of their activity or their inaction. The county council are empowered to sell or to lease surplus land for purposes other than those of small holdings. This is done to enable them, if they think it wise, to take a whole farm, even where the acreage is in excess of that immediately required for small holdings, and so to avoid the payment of compensation for severance which would otherwise have to be provided. Small holders themselves are given a statutory right to compensation for their improvements on the market gardens scale, except, of course, where specific improvements are in direct violation of the express prohibition of the county council in the lease; and all these details and general conditions of tenancy are to be settled by rules to be made by the county council with the approval of the Board of Agriculture. The clause of the Act of 1887 which forbids the erection upon allotments of any except a few specified buildings will be repealed. The county council are instructed to appoint a committee and sub-committees to deal with small holdings. The sub-committees need not consist wholly or mainly of county councillors; and it is suggested in the Bill that in appointing these sub-committees special regard should be had to the desirability of adding to them parish councillors and other persons with local knowledge of the district in which they are likely to operate. Finally, the Board and the county council are enabled to promote the formation of co-operative societies and credit banks for the furtherance of small holdings, and they are permitted to give guarantees, or to make advances to credit banks, under the direction, and with the consent, of the Treasury or the Local Government Board. I have now described, as fully as is necessary at this stage, the provisions of this Bill. I apologise to the House for the time I have occupied, but hon. Members who at other times have had to perform this duty know the difficulty of an oral description of the legal and practical effect of clauses which are not textually before the House. Looking again for one moment at the Report of Lord Onslow's Committee, the House will realise that, though we have adopted and adapted many of their suggestions, we have departed from their recommendations in three main particulars. We have given to the local authorities compulsory powers, which we think are essential, but which that Committee was too timorous to recommend; we have declined to facilitate the absolute sale of small holdings to the occupier; and we have made no provision for loans to landlords for their creation. I do not imagine that any of these decisions will require justification in the present House, certainly not at this stage of the Bill. I do not know how far I shall carry with me the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley, who was a dissentient from the Report of that Committee. I hope we may travel a long way on the road which leads to our common goal. I had the privilege, now, I am afraid, twenty-three years ago, of being one of his very humble assistants in the early days of the agitation for small holdings—days when he had the honour to be the bogey of the bench which he now adorns. There are probably not many Members in the present House of Commons who realise how much we owe on this subject to his earnest conviction and unfailing energy; and I hope he will not think it presumptuous of me if I tender to him the grateful homage of a humble disciple. I am acquainted with the contents of his dissentient Report to that Committee, and on many points we shall find ourselves in complete accord. He regards the conclusions at which that Committee arrived for the provision of small holdings as altogether inadequate. I agree. He objects, if I remember aright, to loans to landlords, on the ground that the increment of the tenant's improvements would ultimately find its way into the landlord's pocket. There again I agree. I think I go even further, and say that these loans are difficult to devise, and complicated to secure, and undesirable, certainly from my point of view, for this purpose. I am afraid he and I may part company on the question of ownership, but I hope that the proposals I have made for the tenancy under a public body, or a local authority, at all events supply some of that reasonable security of tenure which he so rightly thinks that the small holder should possess. I suppose, from some indications I have seen, that we may expect opposition, or, at all events, disapproval of the compulsion which we propose; but I hope we shall hear as little as may be of that loose but very cheap declamation about confiscation. Compulsion has been authorised by Parliament times out of number for public purposes, sometimes with, sometimes without, compensation. But the difference between morality and immorality, between confiscation and justice, is something more than a matter of 10 per cent. on the price. I do not believe myself that the compulsion in this Bill will have often to be enforced, because I think that its mere existence will be a stimulus to voluntary action. I have not thought it necessary or desirable to make any charges in the matter of English small holdings against landlords as a class. We all know the bad landlord, and we all regret that the odium which he so rightly incurs should too often react upon the good landlord, whom we also know—men whose single object has been throughout their lives to do justice to the responsibilities they have inherited. But I know the *vis inertiae* of human nature, and I know the disinclination and hostility in many cases to small holdings of those who are the landlords' natural advisors and necessary agents. I realise, too, the disinclination of individuals to incur what they think are risks without power to ensure their successors against liabilities that may be incurred. But as a landlord myself, I welcome the compulsion which is comprised in this Bill; and, if the House will forgive a personal allusion, I will tell them why. I stand in a position very common to many of my class—a position of considerable difficulty and limitation. I am tenant for life of what the law calls my estate—a tenant for life under a very strict settlement and entail. I have no son. I am therefore compelled, at all events I am morally bound, and so are my trustees, without whom I cannot act, to have regard, in the treatment of my estate, to the interests of the ultimate remainder man, who may be a distant relative, and at all events to exercise strictness of administration, with absence of social and political bias, which I should not feel myself compelled to exercise if I had a son, or if I were the owner of the fee simple. Therefore, I say I welcome this compulsion. Not that it will be necessary to put it into operation actively against myself, but because it will enable me and my trustees to act voluntarily and by agreement in a way which nothing else could have done. I am told, Sir—I cannot believe it—that farmers as a class may see some objection to this measure. Well, it has been my good fortune to know the farmer class most of my life, and from my experience I think I am well assured they are not so blind to their own interests as such a suggestion would imply. I can imagine no proposal more advantageous than this to the farmer who finds himself short of labourers, not all the year round, but in those periods of pressure which are the necessary events of agriculture. Sir, the seasons do not distribute their seed time and their harvests in order to suit the capacity of a depopulated village; and even Ireland under happier conditions might cease to make her annual but casual contribution to our shortage of agricultural labourers. What then could be more economically sound, what could be more financially satisfactory, than to fix upon the soil in close contiguity to the crops a prosperous and contented peasantry—a peasantry who will be able to offer the farmer in the time of emergency that labour which he so greatly needs, and who at other times will be able to support themselves in comparative comfort upon holdings which Parliament alone can enable them to secure? One word I should like to say to all my friends who are equally interested with myself in the question of land values. This Bill has been drafted, and I think rightly drafted, so that if necessary it may stand alone. At all events, I hope that no collateral consideration will be allowed to hinder its immediate passage into law. But it is based upon the assumption that proposals for land valuation will accompany or will succeed it. Therefore it has been constructed so that the application of these proposals will be easy both in principle and in effect. But I will beg those who are really and deeply interested in land reform not to allow their adherence or their loyalty to any one branch of it to cool their ardour for the attainment of even this portion of a desirable reform. I have felt, Sir, that the cause which I have at heart would be be better served by hard thinking than by high talking, and therefore I have put severe repression to-day upon the enthusiasm which I feel for the share of it which has been entrusted to my care.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley): Will the right hon. Gentleman explain how he secures fixity of tenure and fair rents under local authorities, seeing that local authorities are changing bodies and they cannot bind their successors?

*MR. HARCOURT: I do not think on the introduction stage it is desirable to go into these details; but the county council is perfectly able to enter into contracts for any length of time. When the right hon. Gentleman says that it is a changing body, I think the mere fact that it is an elective body, elected by the people, will give that security of tenure which would be desired by the people themselves. If, as I believe, there is a hunger for the land, and if, as I know, there is a hunger for opportunities of advancement outside the cares of our great cities, surely it is the pathos of rural life that, partly by our laws and partly by our lethargy, men who are the flower of our soil should be condemned either to the trials of the town or the shame of the workhouse. Do not let any hon. Gentleman think that it is only those of ample means and of great possessions who can afford to dream of a future of secure competence. The humble toiler in our midst soothes the rigour of his present privations with a vision of that poor but honourable subsistence which might be his if you will revise your laws in order to afford him the opportunity. The dreams of the rich are, after all, only the rumination of possession, but the dreams of the poor are the glimpses of that humble paradise of a secure occupation of the common soil which carries with it the power to transmute the labour of their hands into the purest gold of the creation and the maintenance of a home.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the law relating to Small Holdings and Allotments."—(*Mr. Harcourt.*)

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): I am sure my friends will join with me in congratulating the right hon. Gentleman upon the clearness of his statement in asking leave to introduce this Bill, and also upon the fact that he has done it in a remarkably short space of time. In concluding his remarks, he indulged in some anticipations as to the results of this legislation. While he is perfectly entitled to say what he and his friends hope, it would have been more to the purpose if he had told us how the machinery proposed to be set up is going to provide a remedy for the evils which he described. The right hon. Gentleman expressed the hope, in an earlier part of his remarks, that there would be no controversy as to the extension of small allotments and small holdings. So far as the desirability of extending small holdings goes, there will be no controversy between the two sides of the House. There is not, and there has never been, so far as I know, any objection on the part of anybody in this House to the extension of small holdings, if that extension can be fairly and prudently carried out. But throughout the whole of his speech the right hon. Gentleman lost sight of, or ignored, the facts connected with the establishment of small holdings which are known to everybody who has had practical experience of the work. One of the main objects of the Bill is to enable small holdings to be provided in cases where the local authority has failed to do its duty. The right hon. Gentleman did not say what the causes of the failure had been. Let me remind the House that the county council is elected upon the most popular basis upon which any local authority is elected. It includes the widest franchise there is for any popular election. It is elected for a short period, each election being revised at the end of three years. The local authority having carefully considered the questions and done everything short of providing small holdings, it is provided that a central department, the Board of Agriculture, is to come down and over-ride the local authority and do the work at the expense of the local authority. We are not told whether it would be a reason in the opinion of the framers of the Bill to justify the inaction of the county council if they were able to show that they could not provide these small holdings under the provisions of this Bill. As I understand the measure, it is proposed not only that land should be obtained by methods to which I will refer afterwards, but that the holdings are to be ready for occupation by the tenants who are to occupy them. If anybody looks into the history of the establishment of small holdings, he will find that, if there are not so many of them as some people would desire, the fact is due, not to any reluctance on the part of the landowning class to devote land to that purpose, not to the inability to get land by the various associations, or local bodies, if they so desire, but to the fact, first of all, that the selection of individuals must be made in the most careful way. It is extremely difficult to get men suitable for small holdings. What is the difficulty which has confronted every landowner who has tried to deal with this question? I believe that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred landowners have done their very best to establish small holdings, but the difficulty has been the heavy cost of equipment. How is this to be met? It is proposed to be met under this Bill by laying it on the local authorities in the first instance, and then upon the central authority, the Board of Agriculture, in default of the local authorities. In the second instance, not only the obligation of getting land, but the expense of equipping the farms is to be met in that way. How is the money to be recouped? The right hon. Gentleman was perfectly clear and definite on this point. He told us that the rents of these holdings must recoup the interest and capital. A sinking fund is to be provided out of which the price of the land required for small holdings is repayable in eighty years. That is to make the annual charge as light as possible. How is the right hon. Gentleman going to secure this result? He is not going to do it by standing at this table and telling us that the rents are going to cover the outlay on the security. He should have told us why he believes that the landlord cannot afford to lay out in small holdings land for which he receives a low rent. Why does the landlord not do that if it can be done with a reasonable prospect of success? You have not made a sudden discovery. You have not found the golden key which is to unlock the difficulty which has been at the foundation of the depopulation question during all these years. Surely you ought to have told us what there is in the Bill to enable the local authority, or the Board of Agriculture in default of the local authority, to do more economically work which the resident landlord with all his local advantages has not been able to do and his inability to do which has prevented the increase of small holdings. If this Bill is going to do all you say it is going to do, it is at this stage, without waiting for the Second Reading, that you should state how you are going to get over this initial and most serious difficulty. There is one feature of this Bill which I confess is of special interest to me. We discussed a short time ago a Resolution connected with the Scottish Landholders Bill. The other day, in the Committee upstairs, I ventured to challenge the Secretary for Scotland and his colleagues representing the Government, to apply to English tenant farmers on the same terms the principles which they are applying to Scottish farmers. I said then, and I repeat now, that there is no distinction whatever which any man can draw between the class of tenants to be set up by this Bill and the class of tenants you are seeking to set up by the Scottish Landholders Bill. Although I do not think that you have found a remedy, and although I think there are some details of the Bill to which the gravest objection must be taken, I do congraulate myself as an English landowner and one interested in the solution of the English land question, that the Government have found it consistent with their duty to deal with English land in a manner totally different from that in which they are dealing with Scottish land. I repeat what I said upstairs that it has often been my lot to envy the Scottish laws, and to wish that the Scottish law and practice obtained in England, but I rejoice on this occasion that the choice is in the opposite direction altogether, and that this Bill, whatever objection it may be open to, is totally different in its character and principles. It involves a difference in the way in which it has been presented to the House. The object of both Bills is exactly the same, the only difference being that one applies to Scotsmen and the other to Englishmen. It is interesting to observe the different ways in which the same Government deal with precisely the same question. The right hon. Gentleman told us that he and his Government did not desire to set up small owners. Why? If there is this great land hunger that you believe you are going to meet by the establishment of arrangements for small holdings, if you believe that by the creation of these small holdings you are going to stop rural depopulation and the flow into the towns, why is it you believe men will prefer to be tenants rather than owners of the land on which they are to be placed? The right hon. Gentleman told us that one of the objections was that the tenants might sell the land so acquired, or might turn it to some other purpose. Undoubtedly they might do so. I do not know that there is any great evil in that which should deter you from making the experiment if you really believe the principles which you profess. It is vain to suppose that small holdings can stop rural depopulation. There are scores of cases in which landlords have done their best to create small holdings. I defy the Government to produce any statistics proving that the districts where small holdings have been the rule for generations, where the rents have been low and the conditions satisfactory, show the smallest difference in the matter of depopulation. [Cries of "Oh."] Well, let hon. Gentlemen produce their statistics. In the western counties, for instance, small holdings have been the rule for generations.

MR. WINFREY (Norfolk, S.W.): The small holdings in the western counties are not 15 per cent. of the whole total of agricultural land.

MR. WALTER LONG: The hon. Gentleman ignores the fact that in a great part of the western counties land can only be successfully cultivated if held in large quantities. If the hon. Gentleman thinks that in a great part of Dorset or Gloucestershire men can by this or any other Bill be made to take small holdings and cultivate them successfully out of the class of land there occupied, he is indulging vain hopes. I gather that the local authority is to have power either to buy or lease compulsorily, and I assume that the choice of those methods of acquisition is to rest with the local authority. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to this experiment as being worth a great sacrifice.

*MR. HARCOURT: I never used the word sacrifice or suggested that anybody would have to make one.

MR. WALTER LONG: Then I make the statement myself, and say that if we can solve the land question and bring the people back to the land it will be worth making a sacrifice; but that sacrifice is one which the nation as a whole should bear, as the nation would secure the benefit of the change. If we are going deliberately to adopt a system of compulsory hiring, I do not care what we do for securing compensation for the landlord, we shall expose him to the whole of the risks of the experiment. [MINISTERIAL Cries of "No."] Supposing 300 acres of land are hired in a parish to be let in small holdings, and in fifteen or twenty years the undertaking turns out a complete failure. How is the landlord to be prevented from being the victim of the experiment? He is to be compensated? But where is that compensation to come from? Is it provided in the Bill that when a man receives compensation out of the rates no acre of land belonging to him shall be subject to the rate levied for that purpose? If that safeguard is not provided — and it is not practicable to provide it—the landlord will be compelled to furnish a great part of the compensation out of his own pocket. What has been the difficulty in the matter of small holdings and allotments and the provision of satisfactory cottages? Anybody who read the articles published in the *Daily News*, after careful inquiry, will have seen that it is almost invariably the case on the larger estates throughout the country that the provision of cottages is not only sufficient but good; it is insufficient where the ownership is divided among a variety of hands. When there are several owners there is no direct feeling of responsibility. It is a blunder of the most serious kind to lay these duties on authorities such as the district or parish councils. Their rating area is so narrow that the men who do their work properly, and have provided cottages, allotments, and small holdings, will probably have to pay the greater part of the cost of doing the work of others who have failed to do their duty. The safeguard which it is suggested will be afforded by having regard to the amount and importance of the land is not worth the paper on which it is written. The Government impose restrictions which will make their Bill fail. I believe the local authorities will appreciate these difficulties. They will be face to face in the first instance with the enormous difficulty of providing these small holdings at a rent which it will be possible for small holders to pay. They will have to undertake the disagreeable work of deciding between the cases of different landowners according to the amount and the character of the land they own. If this matter is to be dealt with, I would rather it were dealt with through the Board of Agriculture than by the county councils. The Government are laying on the county councils an extremely difficult task, which it will be almost impossible for them to perform. I do not envy the Board of Agriculture when, just after the election of a county council at which this question has been discussed, it over-rules the local authority. Such a step may be necessary, but it is astounding that it should be proposed by a party who profess to enjoy a monopoly of safeguarding authorities of this kind. As to the question of purchase, it must be remembered that the land is taken from a man, not because he has failed to do his duty, but because his might be the only piece of land in the place which it is possible to use for the purpose required. Ought we not to consider the full extent of the damage which he suffers? On the ground of "severance," or in some way, probably the land will be purchased at additional cost. Therefore, in my judgment, the local authority will not be able to show greater economy than the landlord. The right hon. Gentleman, I think, made an unworthy remark about Lord Onslow's Committee when he said that in regard to compulsion the Government had adopted a line which the Committee were too timorous to adopt. The Committee were not timorous, but believed the recommendations they were making were more prudent and more likely to be successful. I assume that where the local authority fail to do its work and the Board of Agriculture step in, the county council will be called on to make the loan necessary for the purpose. Or will the money be advanced from the Treasury and then be a debt against the local authority? I do not think it very much matters which procedure is adopted, but I have a shrewd idea that there will be very troublous times in store for the Board of Agriculture if they attempt to compel county councils and local authorities to borrow money for a purpose they believe to be unnecessary. I was a little astonished when the right hon. Gentleman said that there might be compensation for these small holdings on the market garden scale. That scale was intended to apply to a specific kind of cultivation—what is called intensive cultivation, and to open that to the small holding, which ought to be cultivated on the ordinary system, will, I think, impose a liability and obligation not justified by the circumstances, and may impose an unjust and not inconsiderable burden on the rates. I heard the last two announcements of the right hon. Gentleman with satisfaction—namely, that power will be taken to aid the formation of co-operative societies, and that some attempt will be made to start credit banks. I believe that anybody who has examined this question—and conspicuously Mr. Rider Haggard—must come to the conclusion that it is useless to set up small holdings by themselves, and that two most useful steps to take are to establish co-operative societies and credit banks. Therefore, I welcome those two proposals—of course, waiting to hear more as to how they are to be dealt with. In conclusion, I would say that, in the first place, I feel that if the Government believe they are entitled to make this experiment throughout the country, they have no right to make it at the expense of those who are probably least able to bear any risk of the kind; and secondly, that when they have determined to do so, their object ought to be to set up occupying owners rather than tenants, only falling back on the tenant system when for some local reason it is impossible to adopt the other. I doubt whether it will be found that local authorities are better landlords than private individuals; I doubt whether they will be found to be as good. So far as the Opposition are concerned, we object to the use of compulsion unless it is used with a view to buying the ownership out and out. I believe it would be far better to set up these men satisfactorily as owners rather than as occupiers. There are other details which it will be necessary to criticise, and probably oppose. Anything the Opposition can say or do will proceed from a desire to do nothing that will prevent the extension of small holdings in cases in which it can be shown that they are necessary and desirable, and can be established under conditions which are likely to act with justice to the people whose land is dealt with and on lines likely to be successful.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he wished to congratulate his right hon. friend on having brought in a measure which had been anxiously awaited for twenty years. He would not refer in detail to the difficulties they had in their struggle in 1883 in regard to allotments when, in co-operation with his right hon. friend the Member for Bordesley, that effort took place and was followed by a claim for the creation of small holdings. The whole justification for this Bill was that the legislation passed in 1892 was, as regarded small holdings, a very bad failure. It was in order to bring about a success in place of that failure that the present measure had been introduced. When the Small Holdings Bill of 1892 was discussed he moved some Amendments, the object of which was to bring the Bill into the shape which the present Bill had taken. They then asked for compulsory powers of purchase, and powers of leasing land by means of local authorities. They gained nothing of that sort in 1892 and in consequence that Act had been a dismal failure. After ten years of activity, the labourers had obtained some 652 acres of land under the Act, representing but a miserable pittance for those who had asked for land, while thousands of labourers had left the countryside in despair of obtaining any standing on the land. Under the Act of 1892 they hoped to give the agricultural labourer the opportunity of rising in the social scale by becoming an allotment holder, the tenant of a small holding, and finally a small farmer or even a large farmer. That was a laudable ambition for a man to have, and it was in order to satisfy it that this Bill had been drafted upon certain lines which embodied compulsion. He believed that compulsion was the essence and kernel of the Bill, not because they wanted to use compulsion to injure the landowners, but because when compulsion was in the background land would be obtainable under better and cheaper conditions. Let them consider the operation of compulsion under the Allotments Act of 1887. In the first instance, what was the result? In the first seven years they obtained 2,249 acres of land for agricultural labourers. Then they passed the Act of 1894 which gave strong compulsory powers, and they obtained 14,872 acres of land in two and a half years instead of 2,249 in seven years. In addition to that, they gave the local authority under this Bill something beyond the ordinary compulsory powers which they had had in the past, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman was wise in letting local authorities do this work in the first instance. He thought they would do the work all the time, but the power given to the central authority to stimulate unwilling local authorities was necessary. Once exercised these powers would not be required to be exercised a second time. The county councils, and all the other local bodies would take up the work and do it in the end. The county councils and local bodies required that there should be this power behind them, because hitherto they had been found unwilling workers in these fields. For instance, one county council had 349 petitions, and the answer they returned was that they thought if they granted them it would be an expense on the rates. But that was no answer at all, as there would be no expense on the rates whatever if the scheme was properly carried out, because the expenditure would be returned ten-fold in local prosperity. As he had stated in 1892, in places where these small holdings were established, poverty decreased, and the population increased. It was, therefore, necessary that the central authority should be able to move the unwilling local authorities in the desired direction. In another case the local authority received fifty-eight applications, and they said they were not enough to justify any action. In such a case as that there should be a central authority behind with power to compel the local authority to carry out the will of Parliament. The object of the Bill was to carry out that purpose, and did not interfere with the operation of the Act of 1892, which enabled such holdings to be sold. The operation of the Act of 1892 had shown there was no great demand for any great increase of small occupying ownerships. They did not introduce legislation for what the people did not want, but for what they did want, and what they asked for was small holdings under the local authority. At the same time small owners could be created under the old Act when there was a demand. He thought that under the Bill they would start small holdings under the conditions which were necessary to success. The local authorities were liable to periodical election, and under the influence of public opinion they would be particularly anxious to see that nothing was done to injure the interests of an honest and good tenant. What was Lord Carrington's experience in connection with this question? His Lordship had had only £12 10s. of bad debts in connection with small holdings during the last twenty years. There were very few estates that could show such a condition of affairs as that.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS: To whom does he let them?

*SIR WALTER FOSTER: To the people in the district.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS: No; he lets them to a syndicate.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER said that in many cases he let them through his own agents to people in the district, and they had proved to be the best payers of rent. He congratulated the Government on having introduced the Bill, which he believed was founded on the right lines and would lead to success, because they relied upon the local authorities in the first instance and they only brought in the pressure of the Board of Agriculture when necessary. They had thus a large opportunity of creating small holdings on an experimental basis. He heartily agreed with the right hon. Member for South Dublin as to the advantage of encouraging credit banks and co-operative societies. The right hon. Gentleman had also referred to the burden that would fall upon the rates in the various localities which put the Bill into force. The one great fear they always had to contend with was increased rates. He himself would be very glad if some scheme could be arranged at a future stage of the Bill, by which the fear of increased rates falling upon the locality could be mitigated so as not to deter any locality from taking advantage of the Act. He could quite understand there was a feeling against the rates being made heavier for the purpose of benefiting one section of the community. He could, for instance, in an urban district, understand the town population resenting the imposition of a rate for the benefit of a smaller section of the community outside the town. So far as the other portions of the Bill were concerned an opportunity to discuss them would arise on the Second Reading. He regarded the Bill as a valuable measure and believed it would be the starting point of great prosperity in many districts. It would give an opportunity of placing many people on the land, which would yield in consequence more produce and retain more population. All the agricultural labourer had asked for in the past was equal opportunity. This Bill would give it, and he would go to his work with a new courage and inspiration now that he saw the day dawn when he might refresh himself with hope.

*MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes) said that there was one feature in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had introduced the Bill that was most welcome on their side of the House. Putting aside the consideration of the provisions of the Bill, they welcomed the tone of that speech as a great improvement on the sort of thing to which they had been treated of late in this connection, but they expected it of the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman recognised that if small holdings were to be a success it would be well that he should carry with him those who were connected with the land; it would be well to enlist their sympathies if possible, and most certainly not to assume their antagonism, and above all it would be better not to abuse them up hill and down dale before asking them to agree to the legislation which the Government had in view. One could understand such methods in a politician on the make, for in these days of halfpenny papers violent declamation paid, noise meant notoriety; but they could not understand such methods in those who were more highly placed, and they had been puzzled at the attitude of the Prime Minister, who, if he might say so without the slightest offence, was too canny as a rule to preface the introduction of an important measure in the House of Commons by flinging minatory rhetoric at those who were chiefly concerned. What were they to think of the assertion that "such common things as pigs and cabbages were offensive to the squire?" Frankly, what were they to think of that? What did the Prime Minister himself think of that assertion by this time? What did those behind him who were conversant with the agricultural position think of it? The Prime Minister knew as well as they did that pigs and cabbages, as evidence of agricultural prosperity, as evidence, to put it no higher, of ability to pay rent, gladdened the heart of the landlord, who had suffered far too many pecuniary losses of recent years to be able to disregard that point of view. Then there was the meeting at Drury Lane. One could only assume that there was something about the atmosphere of Drury Lane which was conducive to exaggerated methods. Experience told them that very often a piece which had been a great success in a small theatre was a dead frost when transferred to the larger stage of Drury Lane. He had often heard it declared by members of the profession that a refined method of acting was impossible at Drury Lane; it did not fill the place, it did not reach the gallery, and a tendency to more robust methods was felt by the actor to be irresistible; the hero must shout, the heroine must shriek and scream. And so he supposed that they must not find fault with hon. Gentlemen if they had to some extent felt the influence of the architectural dimensions of the place and talked big. Unfortunately the Prime Minister, in his speech at Holborn Restaurant, had given the impression, unintentionally no doubt, that he looked upon the small holdings question as a convenient weapon with which to belabour the House of Lords, and the introduction of this Bill as a tactical move in the attack upon the Upper House. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill had, on the other hand, shown that he would have nothing to do with that sort of style. He had very rightly recognised that the question of small holdings was far too important to be made a pawn in the game of party politics. He had shown that he wished to enlist the help of men of all parties, and very rightly had he so spoken, for landowners as a rule would welcome with both hands legislative assistance to establish small holdings where they were economically justifiable. It had been elaborately explained in the House of Lords by members of the Government that the words "blank denial" were not intended to apply to landlords as a rule, but to the apathy of county councils. They were glad that that explanation had been given, for the words were certainly inapplicable to landowners in general. Incontestable figures proved it; the Prime Minister himself had said that half the actual farmers of the present day were smallholders, holders of from five to fifty acres. The report of the Commission on the decline of agricultural population stated that only 3·98 per cent. of agricultural holdings in this country were over 300 acres. Lord Lansdowne had most ably expressed in the House of Lords the views of landowners in general. In so expressing himself he had given the views of all those who had knowledge of agricultural conditions. He had stated that what they wished to see was a system of holdings of graduated sizes, which would enable a man to rise from the ranks, to begin with a small holding, and to climb the ladder to better things, and he had spoken most truly when he said that the landlords would be most anxious to give facilities for such a policy. All who had been concerned in the management of an agricultural estate would know that by far the most desirable tenant was the small farmer, the hard-working farmer who had risen from the ranks. There were many such in the West of England, men who were not afraid of hard work, men who had brought up their sons to put their backs to their work, and to provide labour upon the holding, men who were prepared to start those same sons as they grew up upon small holdings of their own, where they prospered, having been brought up to the work, and knowing how to make it pay. But he begged the right hon. Gentleman not to think that anybody could make a small holding pay, that a man who was a failure in another capacity could make a living out of a small holding. The agricultural industry was as technical as any other; it required a very special knowledge, and without that special knowledge, however assiduously a man might work, he would come to grief over a small holding. As Lord Lansdowne had said, the policy of consolidated holdings, which prevailed in the middle of the last century, was now acknowledged to have been a mistaken policy. It had had far-reaching consequences, for it had to some extent retarded the provision of small holdings. The process of breaking up large farms was continually going on, but it was the expense to the landlord of the transformation which hindered the process. To begin with, they must scrap existing buildings, which would to a large extent become useless, and provide buildings for each of the small holdings: that involved a capital expenditure which most landowners, after the heavy losses they had sustained, were not in a position to incur. He did not think that hon. Gentlemen opposite realised where the difficulty really lay. He himself did not believe that there was any difficulty in getting land for small holdings; the difficulty was rather in providing buildings to make the small holdings pay. The land was no use without the buildings. Lord Onslow's Committee had thus reported—

> "Landlords are willing enough to provide the land, but the difficulty is the economic one of finding buildings."

There, no doubt, was the whole difficulty. It was well known that the simplest cottages could not be put up to pay a commercial rent. How much less possible was it to erect such buildings as were required for small holdings. It was that difficulty which prevented action by the county councils under the Act of 1902. They had been called apathetic, but county councils were no more in a position to make rash experiments than were private landowners. He had always thought that one of the most serious features in connection with the introduction of land legislation by the present Government was the want of knowledge which prevailed amongst hon. Gentlemen opposite with regard to agricultural conditions. He did not say that by way of reproach; how were they to know? They were not able to speak from experience, and he was bound to say that that disability extended to a good many hon. Gentlemen on his own side of the House; but that did not make matters any better. Many hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to look upon all landowners as in the same box. Urban and rural landowners alike were denounced as pampered individuals who had year by year grown richer through the efforts of others. He held no brief for the urban landowner, who in the course of years might have amassed some unearned increment; but how different was the fate of the owner of agricultural land! To begin with, hon. Gentlemen opposite often seemed to forget that nine-tenths of the agricultural land of the country had changed hands by purchase within the last 150 years, so that, as far as the great bulk of landowners were concerned, it could not be said that they had "stolen their land from the nation." How often did they come across an individual who thirty years ago had bought his property on the basis of so many years' purchase of the rental, that rental being now half what it was when he bought? Socialists were urging the Government to appropriate what they were pleased to call unearned increment. What about the unearned decrement? Were they prepared to make that good? There was many a landowner whose ancestor had bought the land a hundred years ago, and who had suffered a decrement of from 40 to 50 per cent. Such a man might be very hard up, and could hardly be expected to find the money to equip small holdings with buildings. He would like hon. Gentlemen opposite to study the balance-sheet of a typical agricultural estate. He thought that a good many of them would be surprised; they would find that rents were now half what they were in the year 1860, while rates and taxes were double. In many cases the rent had been so reduced that it merely represented the interest on the capital expended by the landlord in improving the farm and buildings. The figures adduced by Lord Portsmouth in *The Times* with regard to a single farm on his estate were typical of the depreciation that had taken place. Those figures showed how agricultural landowners had lost money, and when it was remembered that agricultural land was the only form of investment which was assessed for death duties and income-tax on the basis of the gross income derived therefrom, no deduction worth mentioning being made for upkeep and outgoings, it could be well understood how agricultural landowners had come to such desperate straits. Every other industry, every other investment, was assessed, and paid on the net profits actually received. He thought he had said enough to establish his point that the landlords had suffered losses of late years, and that they were not in a position to provide expenditure for buildings. To what extent had that fact been recognised by the right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill. With all due respect to him, the right hon. Gentleman had not recognised it to any great extent. He had talked of small holdings having been withheld by obstructive agents and others, and of *vis inertiæ*, to which he ascribed the want of small holdings. But it was rather the weakness and impecuniosity of the landlords, who, with the best intentions in the world, were not able to provide buildings for small holdings. It was very difficult to judge of the Bill from the statement which they had heard, but the first thing that occurred to one was that the ratepayers would be in a still more parlous condition after the passing of the Bill than they were at present. As far as he could understand, the Commissioners had to go down to enjoy themselves at the expense of the county council. A good deal was left to them to find out as to who should pay for the deterioration of the holding if, at the end of the lease, it should be handed over to the landlord in an impoverished condition. It seemed to him, seeing that the ratepayers were to be called in to such a great extent, that the Government should have paved the way to small holdings by dealing with certain features of the agricultural situation which were bound to hamper those whom they were about to make small holders in their competition with the Continental small holder. For instance, the ideal method of procedure would have been to preface the Bill with the reform of the incidence of local taxation, which was bound to bear upon small holders to an altogether unjustifiable extent. Foreign small holders were held up as models, but what made them prosperous? What enabled them to pour millions upon millions of pounds worth of produce into this country? It was their very efficient system of co-operation. Many had tried, in a small way, to introduce a similar system of co-operation into England, but only those who had tried knew how difficult it was. The Agricultural Co-operative Association had done good work in that connection, but good though that work had been, and successful as the society had been in introducing co-operation in certain districts, it could not be said that a system of co-operation had really gripped the country districts. If the Government could do anything to forward co-operation they would be doing a great work; but if they started a large system of small holdings before the machinery of co-operation was in existence they would run very great risk of failure. He was not blaming the constitution of the Board of Agriculture when he said that they wanted a man like Sir Horace Plunkett to promote co-operation in England—a man of keen enthusiasm, one who knew his job thoroughly, and, above all, one who would forget that he was a politician and absolutely refuse to look upon agricultural questions from a political point of view. He was glad to hear of the establishment of credit banks. In his own county land was continually coming into the market, and he was glad to say that, in many instances, the actual cultivators had bought the land, borrowing two-thirds of the purchase money for the purpose. If the Government by agricultural credit banks could enable the actual cultivators of the soil to borrow money on easy terms in order to equip the land, they would be promoting the division of land-ownership to an extent which could scarcely be realised by those who were not familiar with the position. As he had already said, it was most essential for the success of small holdings that the right men should be chosen for them. It was an extraordinary idea that a man who had failed in every other capacity could make a small holding pay. It was a widespread fallacy, and a fallacy against which they must guard if they wished small holdings to be successful. Small holders on the Continent had been held up to them as models, but it had only been by the hardest work, by constant and continual work, that they had attained success. And why was it that they had been ready to work their hearts out? The incentive had been ownership, and on that account he thought that the Government should make ownership the basis of their small holdings scheme when compulsory powers were put in force. But just as he advocated a policy of assisting small holders to become owners under such circumstances, so he repudiated the policy of compulsory hiring. How could it be justifiable to compel a man to invest his money in a certain way? They must remember that many landowners were very hard-up, and the landowner above all other men was most likely to know whether the particular land was adapted for small holdings. Were they going to say to such a man, "Whether you like it or not, you shall invest your money in small holdings upon this land; we shall not allow you to get out of the land; we shall not give you the chance of selling it, even though you may be willing to do so on reasonable terms. Whether you like it or not you shall try this experiment at your own expense, though you can ill afford to do so." That policy to him was indefensible. He had always held that it was impossible to give a weighty opinion upon a Bill upon the First Reading, upon the explanatory statement of the Minister in charge, able though that statement might be, as it undoubtedly had been in the present case. They ought to see the Bill in print. He did not believe in the new practice which had grown up of dividing against the First Reading of Bills. His memory went back some way, and he remembered that they did not divide against the First Reading of Mr. Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill; neither did they do so in the case of the second Home Rule Bill, and surely there never had been two Bills against the main principle of which they were so strongly united on that side of the House. A division against the First Reading of a Bill militated against the dispassionate consideration of the measure. Dispassionate consideration was wanted for a matter which so vitally affected the rural community. They would give the Bill the fullest consideration when they saw it in print, for they were really and genuinely anxious to arrest the exodus from the country districts into the towns, and to assist the Government in passing wise legislation to that end.

*MR. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire, N.) said he had listened to the speeches on both sides of the House, and he could not help feeling that they would have to come back to the point raised by the previous speaker towards the close of his observations. He had felt, all the time the hon. Gentleman was speaking about the poverty of the landlords, that there was something strange in the circumstance that they should cling to that by which they were losers. They were told that the landlords were hard up, and that they had been losing money for many years. The hon. Gentleman said that they were in desperate straits. If they had lost so much money, why were they afraid to let small holders have a grip upon the land? Though he might not know everything about land tenure, he did know something about the difficulties for the small man to get into touch with allotments and small-holdings. He happened some twenty years ago to be one of the unemployed who lived in a rural district, and for many months he was out of work. Like others he had to look for work in the towns. He could state with truth that there were thousands of poor people who would rather live in the rural districts, but were compelled to leave them because of the insecurity of their employment there. The labourer wanted a constant job, and he sought regular employment, perhaps on the railway, or it might be in some great industrial centre.

And, it being a quarter past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

---

### LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (ELECTRIC SUPPLY) BILL [By Order].

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [9th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question again proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) said he wished to make one or two references to the conduct of this particular business so far as the present and the last session of Parliament were concerned. The difficulty which London reformers found themselves in with regard to this matter was largely due to the attitude of the Board of Trade last session. For some ten years past this subject had been discussed in London, but it had not been settled because the last reactionary Administration would not allow a scheme giving public control to be adopted. London County Council elections had repeatedly taken place, and those contests had been fought upon the principle of public control of monopolies, and on every occasion for the last twenty years the verdict of London had always been in favour of the public control. The London electors, however, had never been able to achieve their object, because there had always been in possession of the legislative machine a reactionary majority opposed altogether to the municipal unified life of London. But January last year saw a Parliament elected to deal with this and other subjects, and for the first time they had the happy conjunction of a Progressive majority in the House and on the London County Council, and London reformers naturally expected to see the problem solved. But for some unaccountable reason the Board of Trade failed to take advantage of the opportunity presented to them last session. Although it was known that the reactionaries would move Heaven and earth to recover the ground which their own incompetence had lost them, that the monopolists and the trust promoters would pour out money like water in order to chloroform the electors, and that a snatched victory was well within the bounds of possibility, the solution of the problem was delayed, and it had proved a very disastrous delay so far as the people of London were concerned. To accept the recent verdict of the electors of London as final would place them in a very awkward position, and that was the feeling of the majority of the Members of the House during the discussion which took place on the Bill before the holidays. He was not satisfied that had the position been reversed and the monopolists and reactionaries been in an overwhelming majority, and the London County Council been composed of a set of men holding entirely opposite principles, the then President of the Board of Trade would have accepted the verdict of London and placed a measure of this kind upon the Statute-book. They were all aware that matters of the greatest importance to London had been burked and thwarted when the monopolists were in power. Considerations of public convenience never weighed in the slightest degree with the late Government, and it was only when there had been a reactionary Council elected for the first time that there had been any hurry and haste to settle this problem. Surely it would be absurd to call the recent County Council election a decision upon the important principle here involved. The sole object of the private monopolists was the exploitation of London's mighty resources. Had the Liberal Party forgotten the London programme upon which elections had been fought for a number of years, in which public control and the public working of these monopolies had been the foremost plank? He was glad that they did not intend entirely to desert their posts because some of the outworks were in the hands of the public enemy. The recent snatch victory at the London County Council election should not be too hastily acted upon, and the County Council and the ratepayers should be given a further opportunity of considering whether they meant to hand over this great city to private exploitation. He agreed that the Instruction placed on the Order Paper by the President of the Board of Trade somewhat modified the position which otherwise he would have been obliged to take up. If that Instruction were adopted it would give breathing time both to the London County Council and to the ratepayer, and an opportunity of considering whether under all the circumstances and the possibilities of the case they considered it advisable to part with the enormous monopoly which this Bill would place in their hands. In view of that Instruction he would certainly vote for the Second Reading, because the Bill recognised as its main principle that the London County Council was the proper authority to control such a monopoly. That was one good principle contained in the Bill. He wished to reserve, however, for himself and for those on whose behalf he was acting, the full right to reconsider their position when the Bill came back from the Committee.

*SIR EDWIN CORNWALL (Bethnal Green, N.E.) congratulated the President of the Board of Trade upon having submitted a proposal which would allow the debate to take a more harmonious turn. He doubted whether the House had ever found itself in the position in which it was that day upon a subject of that kind. The Bill was introduced with the names of four hon. Members of the House upon it, but it was now practically being promoted by other people. That state of things had been brought about by exceptional circumstances. The hon. Members whose names appeared on the back of the Bill were members of the London County Council when that body had a Progressive majority. They were still Members of the House, but the London County Council had now a majority holding different views, and they were promoting the Bill. That was an extraordinary position to be in, and but for the urgency of the question the best thing would have been for the present London County Council to have brought in another Bill embodying their own views in their own way, instead of proceeding with this measure. The urgency of the question, however, justified the present County Council in going on with the measure, and justified those hon. Members who spoke upon the last occasion supporting the Second Reading. He understood the President of the Board of Trade was willing to set up a hybrid Committee, before which a full inquiry could be held, and in his opinion that was the best course to pursue under the circumstances. In allowing that course to be taken, they were rather looking to that Committee to do more than Committees usually did. He agreed that the independent judgment and impartiality of Committees of that kind were invaluable to the work of Parliament; but looking to the particular difficulties of this question, they expected from the proposed Hybrid Committee a full and exhaustive inquiry which would give them help and guidance in regard to the whole question. He had been in communication with the representatives of the outside authorities who were very much concerned about the present condition of things. They said: "We are more or less disturbed at the idea of the London County Council having these very wide powers over our area. If the London County Council get, as they propose, powers from Parliament, and if they then hand them over to a company, we, the outside authorities, will not know where we are in a bargain of that kind." He reminded the House that the Bill extended over an area very much wider than that of the County Council. As to the Instruction which the President of the Board of Trade had put on the Paper, he believed it would enable the Hybrid Committee to go fully into the question. The whole problem must be inquired into. The President of the Board of Trade had stated that they were dealing with the Bill drafted by the London County Council. That was technically true, but it was not only this Bill which would go to the Hybrid Committee, but also the proposals which were made in 1905 and 1906, and the Report of the Committee of last year. It was a little difficult to understand what the present County Council really mean. They were going on with this Bill as drafted, but the following resolution had been passed at a meeting of the London County Council—

> "That the London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill be submitted for Second Reading in the House of Commons with a view to securing an arrangement under which private enterprise undertakes, subject to the control of the Council, the business of the supply of electrical energy, and on the understanding that such alterations as may be required in the Bill to effect this object and to deal with any other matters of importance which may arise on the Bill, will be reported to the Council for its approval as soon as possible."

He wanted to know what the London County Council meant by that. Did the present County Council mean to ask Parliament to give them powers and a franchise, and then to lease those powers and that franchise? He ventured to say that there was no precedent for Parliament handing over a franchise to a local authority in order that the local authority might lease it. If the County Council meant to enter into the whole inheritance which Parliament gave them, and to undertake the whole responsibility, so far as the business was concerned, and then to lease it to some proper body to carry out the working, there was nothing unprecedented in that from the point of view of the House, or from the point of view of other parts of the country. If the County Council were going to lease the franchise, then he agreed with the hon. Member for Stoke that the House must reject the Bill on the Report stage. The hon. Member for Dulwich, when the Bill was recently discussed, referred to the important question of purchase. In the case of electric light undertakings, Parliament had laid it down that the period of purchase was to be forty-two years by the local authorities, but in the case of electricity in bulk Parliament had, he understood, fixed no term of purchase. Here they had a proposal for bulk supply, but the date of purchase of the electric lighting companies had an important bearing. The term of purchase in the case of the present electric light companies in London expired in 1931. They had, therefore, a difficult problem to deal with. He did not suppose that any man would take a lease which expired in 1931, because it would be too short to make it a successful undertaking. How the Hybrid Committee would get over that it was difficult to see, but it must be carefully considered, having regard to dividends, the price to the consumers, and the conditions of labour. It was not a new thing for the Government and local authorities, when entering into contracts, to insist that certain conditions of labour should be observed. He was not one who wished to prevent anyone making a profit, but the business must be conducted on a basis which would give protection to the consumer, and provide that the economic considerations should not be complicated by water-loaded capital. The present local authorities in the county of London had £12,000,000 invested in electric-light undertakings, so that the House would see there were not only matters of great principle involved in the Bill, but most important details connected with the whole problem of electric supply. The House must look to the Hybrid Committee to help them very materially with regard to this great question. Everyone admitted that the present position in London was unsatisfactory and uneconomical. If the Bill failed to pass into law for any reason, it would mean that the existing electrical systems would have to be developed, which would be the worst possible thing for London. They would have the existing companies coming to Parliament next year—they could not for all time prevent their developing their systems, and that would mean going on with small stations and sub-stations, instead of working on the economical basis of a large generating station down the river, at which large vessels could deliver. In voting for the Second

Reading, he and many others reserved their right to move whatever Amendments they might think desirable on the Report stage.

*Mr. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston) said he desired to enforce what the hon. Member opposite had said, though from a different point of view, in regard to the outside areas. It was a fact that the outside areas were greatly interested in this matter. The whole area included in the scope of the Bill exceeded 400 square miles, and of that only a little over 100 square miles were in London. He denied that the authorities outside the county of London were satisfied with the Bill as it stood, or that an arrangement had been made with them. Letters had been written by the outside authorities to the London County Council, in reply to which they had only received an acknowledgment. In Croydon, Wimbledon, Kingston, and elsewhere, electrical undertakings had been established, and large sums of money had been spent upon them. The light was supplied at a reasonable price, and power could be obtained for a very low price. He did not think that anybody in those areas desired that the electrical enterprises should be handed over, even to some extent, to the London County Council. He protested against the proposal that another authority should be allowed to come into those areas after the local authorities had been encouraged to take part in the establishment of electric light and power works, and should either compete with the local authorities or succeed to their options of purchase. He was not sure that the local authorities in the outside areas would be better off than at present by what was proposed by this Bill as explained in the Memorandum accompanying it. He thought it was rather a strong thing to hand over to a private company the powers which had been granted by Parliament to public local authorities. That was a grievance with which he sympathised, and with which he entirely agreed with hon. Gentlemen opposite. At any rate, the outside areas should have some kind of voice in the constitution of the private company and the terms to be made with it. He would not divide the House against the Second Reading of the Bill, but he reserved his right to raise the question on the Report Stage or on the Third Reading, if necessary.

The PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY to the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) said he did not rise to discuss the various points put forward by different speakers. Although all hon. Members could not see eye to eye on the details of this Bill, it was generally agreed, he thought, that it should get a Second Reading and be sent upstairs for detailed discussion. Therefore he asked the House, in view of the discussion to be resumed on the Small Holdings Bill, to allow the Bill to be read a second time.

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Committee of nine Members, five to be nominated by the House and four by the Committee of Selection."—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Ordered, That all petitions already presented against the Bill be referred to the Committee; that the petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their counsel, or agents, be heard against the Bill, and counsel be heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That five be the quorum.—(*Mr. Courthope*).

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee that if any power be conferred upon the London County Council to transfer or lease to any company, local authority, body, or person any of the powers, duties, or liabilities entrusted to it by this Bill, the conditions upon which such power shall be exercised shall be embodied either in this or a subsequent Bill.—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

---

## SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS.

Postponed proceeding on Question, "That leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Law relating to Small Holdings and Allotments," resumed.

*MR. NICHOLLS said he had listened with delight to the introduction of the Bill. He believed that there were thousands of rural workers in different parts of the country who would welcome it as heartily as any one in the House. They were agreed on both sides of the House that something should be done to stop the depopulation of the rural districts and the flow of country workers to the towns. He recognised that the Bill was a real step in that direction; at any rate it was a great advance on anything they had had before, and it would inspire hope in the breast of many rural labourers who had hitherto been unable to get allotments or small holdings. Everybody recognised that there were good landlords, and in those districts there was no difficulty in obtaining allotments or small holdings; but in some areas the parish councils had their hands tied, while in other areas, especially urban districts, their tongues had been tied. The county councils, many of them, were out of sympathy with small holdings, and in those cases nothing had been done to provide them. The right hon. Member for South Dublin seemed to think that the county councils had been showing their sympathy in regard to small holdings. That might be the case in a few instances, but in the majority of county councils nothing had been done. He had received a letter from an agricultural labourer who said that there were only two men on the county council in his district who for years had done anything at all in regard to small holdings. Where the landlord was in sympathy with the aspirations of the agricultural labourers things worked smoothly enough, but the difficulty was the insecurity of tenure. There might be a thousand allotments on one estate, and the owner could any day of the week, and at any part of the year, give notice to them all to quit. Unless a man had security of tenure he could not put his best into the holding; and they would not get the best type of men to go back to the land unless they had security of tenure. He himself had stuck to the land till he was nearly twenty years of age, when he got out of a job. He hunted the whole of the district for sixteen weeks, and everybody said there was no opening. The little he had saved soon went, and it was not before he got to Tilbury, which was a long way from Cambridgeshire, that he found a job. Afterwards he wended his way back to his native county. He could assure the House that every lad who had been brought up in the country had a longing for the land, and his thought was always to get back to it if only he had a fair chance. Acting upon that impulse, he went back to the land and found work of a rough kind. Having left once more he again came back and found work in the stone pits. Then he got an allotment of a quarter of an acre, and his mind became centred upon that little plot of land. He remembered that on the first Jubilee Day of Her late Majesty he spent the beginning of it upon that allotment, while others were getting warm for the after day celebration. He kept at work at the stone pits for five years, and meanwhile his allotment rose from a quarter to half an acre, then to a holding of one acre, then three acres, although he never got the cow which his right hon. friend had promised. Great hardship was occasioned by the fact that plots of land could not be had in the neighbourhood in which a man lived, and in his case, in order to get three acres, he had to have five plots in different places, in regard to some of which he paid £3 an acre and for some portion even a higher price. He had a wife who was not ashamed to help a little on the land, and he was enabled in the course of five years to lay the foundations of an existence which would make him a freer man. Some people talked about politicians being on the make, but the moment the labourer got his foot upon the soil he prospered. The politician was not the only man who was on the make, and there was no harm in the labourer being on the make in order to acquire a little plot of land which would make him freer. The freer and more independent a man was the better he was. Out of the nine men who worked in his gang in the stone pits there were, including himself, five who were able to leave and start on their own. Two of them had large farms under the Duke of Bedford, and in each case the plot of land had grown from portions of an acre to more. He got letters every day from agricultural labourers in all parts of the country who felt that they had every right to tell him their stories. The effect of them was that in many cases the demand for land had in past years been met with a blank refusal. The difficulty they had to deal with was that the large farmer was prejudiced against the smaller man, and that prejudice was shared by the landlord, while the land agent did not want the trouble of a number of small holdings. In one instance that he knew the first question the land agent asked in regard to an application for a small holding was "What is your client in politics and religion?" The agent for the tenant said, "I should have thought that that was the last thing that the man would have been asked about. All I can say is that the man is of sound character and good standing and he has the capital to work the small holding for which he is applying." He would have thought that those recommendations were overwhelming, but the reply was, "Oh, well, you know, it is not quite that, but we do not want a lot of Radical Dissenters on the estate." He felt that the time had come at last when the local councils should have power to act in those districts where they had been faced with that blank denial or refusal of land, and if the local authority refused the people the privilege they should have a right to appeal to a central body or Commission. That central body might be responsible to the Board of Agriculture or be the Board of Agriculture itself, but until the people felt in regard to questions of this sort that they had somebody to whom they could go, beyond those local people who could not, in many cases dared not, move, the situation was hopeless. Many of the smaller men knew that the difficulty they had to face was that if they moved in the matter they themselves would not get any small holdings. They were called firebrands, and had in consequence to suffer. Only last Wednesday he received a letter in which his correspondent said that in his district there were several hundreds of acres let in allotments or small holdings, but in every case when they made a move and "agitated" in order to make it felt that there was a demand for the land, those who had done the agitating did not get any small holdings. His correspondent said that in that particular instance the land agent had taken up the matter and had doled out small holdings of land to men who wanted them, but the five men who had raised the question had been boycotted and could not get a foot of the land which had been granted. That was the reason why, if the smaller councils and the smaller local district bodies were fettered, tongue-tied, and hand-tied, the people felt that they should have the right, as under this Bill, to go to the centre where there was somebody who could inquire into the situation and find out whether there was a demand for land which was suitable and men who were suitable to take it. That seemed to be the difficulty, but his experience was that there were always far more suitable men demanding land than could get holdings, and whenever the landlord was favourable and offered land, if it was suitable and the rent was reasonable, there was always a greater demand than supply. But in some districts the land was not suitable, and in some cases the men who wished to acquire a small holding were not suitable. He himself was not in favour of taking men from the towns and putting them in colonies and trying to teach them the difference between a weed and a potato, when there were thousands of men in the rural districts who knew all about it and were prepared to put all their time and energy into the work, and had, moreover, a little capital. He had been ready to go back to the land, and there were hundreds of others willing to do so, but they would not go back to be merely the day labourer of another man. He had no faith in the doctrine that a man who did his duty to his master had no reserve strength for his garden or allotment. He thought that a man who had done a fair day's work for his master could still find time to cultivate his little piece of land. Then there was the question of whether a man in that position of life should pay rent in advance, and that was a ticklish question for a poor man. He would take his own case. He paid the first quarter in advance and there was the rent to pay every quarter after he took possession, and a year from the day after he did so he had paid his fifth quarter's rent. Because he had stated that, the landlord said "Nicholls has stated that they" (meaning the small holders) "are paying five quarter's rent a year." He had said nothing of the kind. What he said was that he had paid five quarter's rent down before the land had been of any use to him. After describing the advantages which labourers reaped from keeping pigs and the many ways in which a man with a low wage could and did make both ends meet, when he had a holding, he said he would like to do something to show that men of that class could be trusted to help them to tide over the difficulty of the first year, and to make it clear that the Liberal Government did really this time mean business and were going to help the larger number of people, even if they hit a few in order to do it. After all, every man, whatever his politics might be, must recognise that they had to look after the welfare of the poor, even though in doing it those who were better off had to suffer a little. In considering this Bill, everyone must see that they were going along the right line, and he believed that they would get some of the Opposition to help in the work

*MR. LLEWELYN WILLIAMS (Carmarthen District) thought the House was to be congratulated on the tone of the debate, and on the speech of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He gathered from the tone of the speeches which had come from the Opposition that the Bill would stand a fair chance of passing into law. He was glad that the question had now come to be regarded as urgent, for he felt sure that the depopulation of the rural districts of England and Wales was nearly as great as the depopulation that had occurred in Ireland during the last sixty years. In the Llandovery district of Carmarthenshire the population had gone down from 14,000 to 7,000 between 1841 and 1901, or about 50 per cent; the diminutions of population would also be found to be the same in many rural districts which he had tested by the census returns. Those diminutions must be looked upon as permanent, for the number of inhabited houses had dropped by 35 or 40 per cent. during those years. The right hon. Member for South Dublin did not believe that small holdings would be a deterrent to depopulation, and had asked them to procure statistics to prove it. Wales was a land of small farms, the average holding running from 80 to 100 acres. If a comparison were made of the number of farmers engaged in agriculture in Wales to-day with the number engaged in 1841, no appreciable decrease would be found, notwithstanding the fact that within the last few years rents had been high, tenure was more insecure than in any other part of the country, and men had had to sacrifice more for their religion and politics than anywhere else in the Kingdom. The cause of the rural depopulation was due to the decline in the number of labourers from 66,000 in 1841 to something like 33,000, a decrease of about 50 per cent. He agreed that some of those men must have left from economic causes. In Ireland, the rural population left for the Colonies or the United States, but in Wales they were fortunate in having had large industries developed within the last fifty years, and therefore the agricultural labourer could secure employment either in the quarries or in the mines of Wales. He did not say that it was possible to keep all the rural population at home; it would not be good if they could; but he thought that the rural depopulation had gone further than it ought, and it was necessary to prevent it. Therefore, he thanked the Government for introducing the Bill, which seemed to him to be the best, the wisest and the most courageous of the measures for which they were responsible. It was not only in the interest of the agricultural labourer himself but also in the interest of the landlord and the farmer that the labourer should be kept on the land. From his own knowledge of those men he believed it was possible to get many of them back to the land, if proper conditions were offered. Whether that were so or not, he thought it was the duty of the House, in the interests of the nation at large, and not merely in the interests of a class, at all events to see that the agricultural labourers who were still on the land were kept there. He thought the Government had suggested the proper remedy. The first thing, undoubtedly, was to take away from the landlord the necessity for providing capital; and he quite agreed that the real reason why the landlords had been unable to act in the past was that their property was tied up in such a way that they were unable to provide the necessary funds themselves. The Government, as he understood, in order to meet the position, were giving power to the county councils compulsorily to acquire land and to equip the small holdings with cottages, spreading the repayment of the money over eighty years. He thought that got over two of the greatest difficulties which had been experienced in the past—the getting hold of land and equipping it with what was necessary for its proper cultivation. He understood that the extent of the allotment would be raised from one acre to five acres, and that the Act of 1892 was not to be interfered with, though it was not to be encouraged, that the allotment could be bought by the small holder. Speaking for those small farmers and peasants of Wales, he found that the instinct of property was so highly developed in them that he was perfectly certain that in order to get a better and more speedy solution of the problem some system of peasant proprietorship should not be excluded. With regard to the other remedy suggested in the Bill, he had found from his experience of co-operative effort that the great difficulty had always been to retain the young men on the land in their own district, and the failure of nearly every co-operative effort with which he had been connected had been due mainly to the fact that when the young men who had started it migrated to other countries or to the towns, the energy of those societies had disappeared. Now that the Government had taken the matter in hand he hoped there would be a permanent organisation which would keep alive the co-operative societies in the country districts. With regard to credit banks there was one matter of great importance to many country districts and especially to the Principality. A great deal was heard of the woes of the landlords and the woes of the tenant farmers, but very little was heard of the woes of the peasant proprietor who had been forced into buying his holding in order to secure fixity of tenure. Yet he knew cases where in order to secure fixity of tenure holdings had been purchased at seventy years purchase and where the tenant was paying more in interest than would be paid in rent. Nothing had, however, been proposed for the relief of that class. He hoped when the Government established credit banks something would be done to alleviate the burdens of those poor people.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS said the speech of the hon. Member who had just spoken was in favour of lightening the burdens and difficulties of those who would like to own the land. This Bill put a positive barrier against the aspirations of that class. He fully admitted the great advantages of credit banks and co-operative associations, but they had never thrived in countries where tenancies prevailed. In Denmark, France, and Germany credit banks and co-operative associations were the natural outcome of ownership. Although by the efforts of associations and of private landowners co-operation had made some progress in this country, it was an exotic; it did not spring naturally from tenancies, and never could do so. He expressed the pleasure which he felt that the policy of small holdings was no longer in a debateable stage. They were all agreed on it. Thirty years ago it was a subject of ridicule and even of contempt. He thanked his right hon. friend for his eloquent and lucid explanation of this measure, and also for the manner in which he had referred to his own endeavours. The right hon. Gentleman had put the matter in the most favourable light possible. It was not a political question and ought not to be a Party question. It was a question of life and death to the nation—one to which every other question was second. He read the speech made by the Prime Minister at the Holborn Restaurant with an immense amount of pleasure, and he agreed with all that was said by the right hon. Gentleman about depopulation and the necessity of dealing with the subject in the interest of the welfare of the people. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman was subjected to a great amount of pressure, and his hopes rose high when the right hon. Gentleman said there were to be provisions, sweeping and strict, to enable the peasantry to live on their holdings and to call their souls their own. There was not such a thing as a peasant in the country. The peasant was a man who owned his holding, and there were peasants in this country for 1,000 years until they were deprived of their land and became mere agricultural labourers. After that great flourish of trumpets, however, the outcome had not been what one had been led to expect; and he was somewhat disappointed with it. His right hon. friend had said that they could not very well stay the stream of migration to the towns. He maintained that they could not only stay the stream, but reverse it. There were hundreds of thousands of men in the towns who had been brought up on the land, who knew all about it, who were good cultivators, and who would return to it on proper conditions. But they would not go back as day labourers or tenants. He could show hundreds of letters to prove that if land purchase were the basis of the Bill, people would flock back to the land.

*Mr. HARCOURT said the Government had adopted the Act of 1892 which gave an opportunity to purchase. This Bill was an addition to that.

*Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said that was the mistake that had been made. To ask an agricultural labourer on a purchase of land of £200 or £300 to put down 20 per cent. was to call upon him for something he could not do. When a Bill was introduced to remove that difficulty the other day the Chief Whip said the Government could not let the Bill pass because they had a measure of their own. But the Government Bill did not touch that matter. The Government refused to remove that bar of poverty which was the one great drawback to the Act of 1892. That Act had been an unqualified success where it had been put into force. In Worcestershire they had overcome the 20 per cent difficulty. Some members of the council had advanced money to suitable men, and in other cases payment had been postponed. In Worcestershire they could see men who had lived for twelve years in absolute prosperity on their little holdings, and the whole question was solved. The Act had not been a failure, except in areas, and that was because the county councils generally had not put it in force by reason of the money difficulty. If they would only take the large sum of money they were going to spend under this Bill and hand it over to the county councils for the purpose of putting the Act into operation they would find great results, whereas under the system now being proposed the money would be thrown away. The present Bill was admittedly opposed to peasant proprietors. No agricultural labourer in the country could ever hope under this Bill to possess a tiny bit of ground. But he would make the Prime Minister a present of a Bill in which he would find a solution of the whole problem without the paraphernalia of Land Courts and other expenses. [The right hon. Gentleman handed a copy of the Land Purchase Bill to the Prime Minister.] A great deal had been heard about "fixity of tenure." What was "fixity of tenure"? The Government did not give it; and it could not be given except by ownership.

*Mr. HARCOURT: I expressly said I gave no fixity of tenure at all, except that derived from tenure under a public body. I said the fixity of tenure I gave was not one which would confer on the occupier any power of sale.

*Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said that that made the Bill ten times worse. The poor agricultural labourer had to depend for his fixity of tenure and his rent upon the local authority. The local authorities were a changing body, and they might find upon those bodies men like the hon. Member for Preston, who thought they could measure up by rules all human interests and desires, total them up, and tell them exactly what they amounted to. Such men, if elected to the local authority, might say: "This body of small holders has been paying £1 per acre for land which is worth 30s., and in duty to the ratepayers we ought to let it at the higher figure." That kind of thing would assuredly happen under the local authority. If the poor labourer by his exertions made the land of more value, his rent would be raised, and if he were turned out he would get no compensation worth naming. It was absurd to say that small holders did not desire to own the land they cultivated. The contrary was only common sense. The magic of ownership was intuitive, because it brought out the best powers of the cultivator in a manner which no form of tenancy could achieve. As to the proposed Commissioners under the Board of Agriculture, they had men at that Board second to none in ability, power, and understanding. They could not be bettered, and all that had to be done was to give them a little more help, and all the expense of this Commission would be saved. The present Government could not do anything without creating a new office, though they had everything to their hands. They reminded him of the proverb that "A bad workman always complains of his tools." The power of the Commissioners in the Bill was a monstrous proposition which would not be accepted in any country in Europe except Russia.

Were they going to allow a central body to override the wishes of the elected members of a local authority and make the ratepayers of that locality pay for something to which their elected representatives were opposed? How could they put such a proposition into force? Were the elected members of it to be sent to prison? Would the ratepayers pay a rate when they had had nothing to do with striking it? It was as monstrous a proposal as was ever made. The right hon. Gentleman had described the Bill as the Bill of Rights of the labourer. All the loans and sinking fund and interest for which the local authority might become liable in putting the Bill into operation were to be paid by the rent. Was that a Bill of Rights for the labourer? He was not afraid of compulsory purchase, but compulsory letting on the proposed scale suggested serious questions. It was one thing to give parish councils the power which they had hardly ever used, of letting one acre for an allotment, but quite another thing to establish a system of compulsory letting in regard to holdings which might run up to hundreds, perhaps thousands, of acres. There must be a house put up on the holding; to whom was it to belong at the end of the lease? The housing question was solved by the tenant proprietary system, but not by the plan of hiring. In Worcestershire there had been an experiment with thirty-two small holdings, and in connection with about a dozen of those there were nice homesteads. They were included in the holdings, and the tenants paid back the price by annual instalments. If the land was let under this Bill, what would become of the house at the end of the lease? That was a question to which he should like an answer. His right hon. friend had said there was going to be £100,000 spent under the Bill. If that money were spent in enabling local authorities to put the 1892 Act in force, the difficulties would disappear, and all the proposed paraphernalia would be unnecessary. It was said that at the end of the term the tenant would have the right of compensation. That would depend upon whether in view of the county council he had observed all the conditions of cultivation which had been laid down. Under this scheme there must not only be commissioners, but inspectors to see that the land was properly cultivated. The county council would be in the position of the landlord. Nothing of the kind was necessary under the ownership system, where the local authority was simply the receiver of well secured instalments every year. Reference had been made to the Report of Lord Onslow's Committee. It should be remembered that not a single labourer, or anybody connected with labourers, gave evidence before the Committee.

MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe) said he brought forward a tenant on his estate who was formerly a labourer.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS said several tenants gave evidence, but there was no witness representing the labourers, although dozens could have been found to give evidence. The only legislation that had had any effect in keeping men upon the land had been promoted by the Unionist Party, and the Act of 1892 indicated the direction in which legislation ought to go. One man who had acquired a holding under that legislation sold £600 worth of produce in one year. But for that legislation the money would have gone to Belgium to pay for the stuff. He remembered going down on his knees almost to Mr. Gladstone, and asking him to do something of the kind, but the Party did not then care twopence about the agricultural labourers, except for political purposes—[MINISTERIAL cries of "Oh, oh."] Mr. Gladstone came into power on an Amendment he had proposed, and when the Liberals climbed into office by the votes of the agricultural labourers, the latter were cast aside. He would ask his right hon. friend whether he could vindicate the adoption of tenancy in lieu of ownership, except on Socialistic grounds. Hon. Members below the gangway might plume themselves on having captured the Government, in that they had induced the introduction of tenancy instead of purchase. They did not want increase of ownership, and they had succeeded so far, but the question was whether it was best for the country. There were only two alternatives, the Socialistic principle of the nationalisation of the land, and the principle of purchase. He had studied the question for many years, both in England and in almost every country in Europe. In the case of Denmark, for instance, it was only after they had adopted the principle of ownership that prosperity began to flourish amongst the small holders. So in Germany and other continental countries, he found that the principle of ownership underlay every attempt for the improvement of the agriculture population. To adopt the principle of tenancy in the Bill would be to fly in the face of all experience. The welfare of the country—aye, its very existence—depended upon the restoration of the peasant proprietor and the yeoman farmer. It was by legislation that they were destroyed; and it was only by legislation that they could be restored. But this Bill set up a barrier to their restoration. It divided public opinion into two camps, one favoured by the Government, that there should be no occupier who was owner of the soil, and the other approved of by all Chambers of Agriculture and by the villagers, namely, complete ownership. He hoped the time would come when the Unionist Party would place good, honest purchase and ownership on its banner. He agreed that at present that was an unauthorised programme. If they went into any village and put it to the agricultural labourers whether they would prefer tenancy under a local authority, which would be the worst form of tenancy, to ownership with the local authority only acting as the receiver of annual instalments, there would be a unanimous acceptance of the latter alternative, provided always that the bar of poverty were removed. He sympathised with the pathetic statement of the hon. Member for Northamptonshire of the longing desire of men born on the land to get back to the land. Arthur Young had well said that "the magic of property turns sand to gold." He believed that ownership would double the productiveness of the land. Why was that? Because a man who was dealing with his own land worked hard. It might be called slavery, but it was not. The man got up at five o'clock in the morning and worked upon his holding in the interests of himself. He put his labour into his own land and it became his bank. He was surprised that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite should try to show the advantage of tenancy over ownership, because in his view ownership would be of an advantage not only to the individual but to the community. He agreed that there was no absolute property in land; there never was and never could be, because the community had the right to demand that it should be worked under conditions which should produce the very best, and in his view no conditions could produce the very best, unless the land was worked under a system of ownership. He must apologise for keeping the House so long, but he wished to urge his principle, which was that of an honest purchase at a fair price, and his contention was that without that no small holder would be content. Let the Board of Agriculture, as an experiment, be directed to buy an estate of from four to five hundred acres, break it up into holdings of from five to fifty acres, and, totalling up the entire cost for roads and so on, put a fair price upon each. When such holdings were advertised for sale on easy terms, with repayment, interest, and sinking fund by annual instalments, there would be hundreds of applications from men experienced in agriculture. Why should not that be done, instead of embarking on impossible schemes foredoomed to failure?

*MR. WINFREY (Norfolk, S.W.) said he rose with much pleasure to support the Bill. For fifteen years he had spent a good portion of his time in attempting to put into operation the Small Holdings Act of 1892, and the result had been most unsatisfactory. When the experiment was made in Lincolnshire of a county council purchasing three farms under that Act their experience was that not a single applicant desired to purchase holdings. He thought that the fixity of tenure under this Bill would be quite as good as that which the tenant farmers of the country enjoyed at present. He saw no reason why fixity of tenure should not be as great under a local authority as under a private landlord. The Bill proposed that the land should be purchased under sound economic conditions, and that the money should be borrowed and repaid over a term of eighty years, the rents to cover the repayment during that term. They had found no difficulty in so fixing the rents in Lincolnshire as to secure repayment in a term of fifty years. His right hon. friend had said that at the end of fifty years the land did not belong to the tenant, but during that period the ratepayers had been pledging their credit, and were entitled to take possession of the land considering that during the whole of the period it had been let to the tenant at a fair rent. As to the difficulty of taking land on a lease for twenty-one years, and erecting houses and buildings upon it, he took it that no local authority would be likely to lease land for that purpose for that period. In many cases the question of erecting houses and buildings would not arise. Moreover, it was quite possible for a county council to buy 100 acres of land adjoining 500 or 600 acres which they had leased and erect the necessary buildings upon that so that the two schemes of purchase and leasing could run together. As to past legislation he did not wish to indulge in recrimination, but as the right hon. Gentleman boasted that the Party with which he was now allied was the only Party which had brought about any successful legislation in this matter, he must remind him that the Act of 1892 was a ghastly failure. Petitions were sent up from twenty-seven English counties asking for small holdings; of those counties only six had put the Act into operation, and in those six counties only a paltry 800 acres of land were acquired. That showed plainly the Act was a failure. In point of fact it was not passed with the intention of its being a working Act, but as a window dressing Act upon which to go to a general election. Moreover the Government knew that the failure of the Allotment Act of 1887 lay in the expense of putting the compulsory clauses into operation. Yet with that experience before them they deliberately passed a Small Holdings Act without any compulsory powers whatever. He did not condemn the Act of 1887 without a trial. For two years he explained the Act in the villages in the district where he lived and they applied to the boards of guardians for 1,600 acres of land. At the end of that period they had not succeeded in obtaining a single acre. The Act of 1887 gave very large powers of asking for land, but very small powers for getting it, and it was not until the county councils came in being in 1889 that they succeeded in getting any land at all. Then they succeeded in getting 13 acres, for which the board of guardians gave £67 an acre, and for which, after adding the cost of management and an estimated amount for bad debts, they charged the people 84s. an acre or 6½ per cent. on the purchase price. The Government recognised that the Act of 1887 was a failure, because they brought in in 1890 an amending Act transferring the powers to county councils. In his district they made use of this amending Act, and the compulsory powers which, though never used, had the advantage that the mere threatening to enforce it led to agreements, and between 1890 and 1894 they succeeded in getting 800 acres of land for allotment purposes. He maintained, however, that it was not until the Parish Councils Act was passed the land needed was obtained for allotments. The official Returns showed that less than 3,000 acres were obtained under the Acts of 1887 and 1889 and before the Parish Councils Act was passed, while in the nine years succeeding 18,000 acres of land were obtained. The right hon. Member for South Dublin had said that ninety-nine out of every hundred landowners tried to get small tenants on their land. He would like to know where those landlords lived.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport): All over the country.

*MR. WINFREY said that in that case as men of business they had made a dismal failure of their attempt. It seemed to him that the modern landowning class did not go the right way to work in order to ascertain the wishes of the agricultural labourer as to small holdings. It was difficult to focus the demand for small holdings, because the agricultural labourers had no organisation, and the landowner with the best intentions did not get at the bottom of their views, whilst the larger farmers were quite out of touch with the labourer so far as small holdings were concerned. Those also who controlled estates in the hands of mortgagees or in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and other bodies did not consider the labourer. The agricultural labourer did not carry his heart on his sleeve, and was slow in his expression of opinion until he could ascertain whom he could trust. In the year 1885—and this showed the different point of view from which hon. Members opposite approached the question of allotments and small holdings—the right hon. Member for

Wimbledon was then one of the representatives for Lincolnshire. In those days the Liberals advocated three acres and a cow, but the right hon. Gentleman went up and down the county saying that half an acre was enough for any working man. And he had the courage of his convictions, for when the Allotments Bill of 1887 was before the House he put down an Amendment that no allotment should exceed half an acre. That was the spirit in which in times past the Party opposite had approached the land question.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: We passed Bills for all that.

*MR. WINFREY: Yes, but they were hardly worth the paper they were printed on. The agricultural labourer had no such organisation as had the skilled labourers of the town, and, therefore, it was very difficult to focus the demand for small holdings. Only a few days ago they had a deputation from Lincolnshire to see the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster with respect to small holdings in Lincolnshire; and only on the previous day he had received a letter from one of that deputation, who was a small shopkeeper. The writer said that since the deputation he had suffered in his business, for on the previous Saturday his man (his correspondent was a grocer) when he called at the Royalty Farm was told that he was not to call there again for orders because Mr. Ward had heard that his employer had taken part in the deputation. The writer had done business on the farm for thirty years with nearly all the people who resided on it. Mr. Ward was a non-resident farmer. There were several cottages on the farm, and the occupants had been actually told not to buy their groceries from this man who had supported small holdings. [AN HON. MEMBER: What parish?] The man on his rounds was told by the tenants what had been said by Mr. Ward, who was a tenant under the Duchy of Lancaster, and had just recently been made a magistrate. But coming back to the question of small holdings in his district. Having gone through all the preliminaries with respect to allotments, and having fairly well succeeded with the parish councils in 1894, they were then able to make a solid attempt to put the Small Holdings Act into operation. He thought, however, that he would be able to show the House wherein that Act had failed. They succeeded, it was true, in purchasing three small farms. They arranged everything on sound economic lines. The rent covered the repayment of principal and interest, but although they did that they could not get the county council to proceed any further; they said they would wait to see whether the experiment was a success. That was thirteen years ago, and the county council were still waiting. He was chairman of the committee during the time, and they had a great many inquiries for small holdings, and for ten years there had been lying with the county council applications for at least 1,000 acres, but no further steps had been taken. Had it not been that the present President of the Board of Agriculture had come to their assistance by leasing them two farms of 700 acres, they would not have been able to do anything more to meet the demand in the district. They let the farms very successfully to men who had made their allotments a success; these men had practically fixity of tenure as long as they paid their rents and cultivated the land properly. The moment they ceased to cultivate the land properly they ceased to be desirable tenants. It was quite true that they had only taken a lease of the farms for twenty-one years, but he thought that the owner was quite prepared to continue the transaction seeing that he was paid his rent regularly and was not asked for abatements. The demand of which he was speaking had been met and satisfied; and he maintained that there was the same demand in many other parts of the country. When they first took those 700 acres they had the land for seven years, and, to show how little capital the men had, they were unable to let the grass land as the applicants had only sufficient capital to take arable land; they had to let the grass land as accommodation land to a local butcher. But in the second year some of the men said that they were ready to take the grass land, and £100 was spent in fencing it in.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): Did you put up the houses on those small farms?

*MR. WINFREY said the farm houses were divided into two tenements, and there was also the shepherd's house and three cottages on the farms, which gave accommodation for eight resident tenants. The whole of the other holders were men who lived in the surrounding district, and many of them had to go three or four miles to the land; so they had been really under a disadvantage because they had not the money to build cottages. The same local landowner had a farm which became vacant suddenly three weeks ago, owing to the death of the tenant. His widow was obliged to call the creditors together, and there were considerable arrears of rent. There were at once several applications from different men living in the neighbourhood for small holdings. That farm was not near a village or even a hamlet; it was a wide and scattered district in the Fens of Lincolnshire—a few small cottages, a public house, a blacksmith's shop, and a chapel. The applicants had written to him saying that they could do with the farm, and within ten days the property had been let in ten small holdings. The farmhouse and the three houses upon it vided accommodation for five tenants; the other men were living in the neighbourhood. The deceased farmer had not been successful, but they hoped that the small holders would succeed where the larger holder had not succeeded. He would like to ask the right hon. Member for Wimbledon what had been done in the Sleaford Division during the last twenty years, and whether he had explained the Act of Parliament to the working men in that district. In the neighbouring Stamford Division there were some 4,000 acres of Crown lands. There had been a demand for small holdings there for thirty years, but up to now they had met with a blank refusal from the managers of those lands to let any part of them for small holding purposes. But the moment that policy was reversed petitions were sent to the Board of Agriculture asking that some six or seven hundred acres in that particular district should be let for small holdings. He would like to give to the House as an illustration the case of a little village called Eastville, which contained a population of 400 people, an acreage of 2,657, and a rateable value of £3,924, where the men were applying for some Duchy of Lancasters' land. Upon that land there were six large farmhouses tenanted by foremen and only two resident farmers. This year eight young men left the village and two of them had gone to Canada, and none of those young men could get small holdings in the locality. In a letter received from a neighbouring parish where there was a better opportunity of getting small holdings the writer said—

> "I support the application for small holdings because I have seen the advantage of them. In order to show that people will not only remain on the land when they can get it, but will also come back to it, I can name seventeen persons who left this parish as young men and after saving a little money they have come back and are now occupying land. They include five ex-policemen, four ex-railway men, three ex-greengrocers, and three who have been abroad. As every house in the parish is occupied and as several houses have lately beeen built, I have no doubt the population is increasing. There are a large number of young men who would hire small farms if they could get them, but stewards who had farms to let seemed to prefer to let them to men who had large occupations."

That was in Lincolnshire. The statement was very often made that the land was very good in Lincolnshire, and that they could not do in other counties what was being done in Lincolnshire. He had made an experiment to see whether they could succeed upon land of half the capital value of that of Lincolnshire, and so he formed a voluntary association, who in 1900 purchased three farms in the county of Norfolk. The land cost them about £20 per acre, and they were letting it at about 20s. and 22s. per acre. The men they put upon that land had paid their rent regularly during the last six years, not one of them desired to purchase, and he thought they possessed a fairly good fixity of tenure. The steward who managed that estate wrote—

> "I paid a casual visit to Carbrooke in March. This is a farm of 109 acres and was previously occupied by a local farmer as an 'off' farm. The farmhouse was not tenanted except by an aged female caretaker, and the labour employed was such as the farmer sent over casually from his home farm. On going over the farm in March I found our principal tenant (Haylock), a man with seven children, employing two labourers I found four tenants in addition working on the land with horses and a hired team, in all twelve horses and eight men. The crops grown by the retiring farmer in the last year of his tenancy yielded not more than six coombs of barley and seven coombs of oats per acre. Haylock's average for barley during the last three years has been eleven coombs. On his

> fifty-seven acres I found three horses and twenty head of cow stock. During the year 1905 he turned out twenty-six bullocks for the butcher, and in the following year 1906 he fattened eighteen bullocks and 116 sheep. In addition to maize Haylock has consumed on the farm eighteen tons of linseed cake during twelve months. He told me he had spent £200 in feeding stuffs in twelve months. I have received applications for more land from four tenants on this farm, and from two of the sons of the present small holders."

That man only started farming three years ago with a capital of £100. What he was anxious to point out to the House was that the demand for these holdings existed, and that a certain amount of assistance was necessary to establish the men on the land. Quotations had been made in both Houses of Parliament from the correspondents of the Board of Agriculture with regard to the demand for small holdings in different counties. Some hon. Members had drawn from those Reports the conclusion that those who supported this Bill were exaggerating the demand. There was a case in the county of Norfolk in which the correspondent of the Board of Agriculture wrote that small holdings were readily obtainable when required, but there was no particular demand for small holdings in the district. That was written by a man who had himself large farms about six miles away from this small holding which he could see every day as he drove to his own farms. In Cambridgeshire the experiment of the hon. Member for East Cambridgeshire was going to be a great success. In that case a Crown farm which the Crown had farmed for two years at a loss was taken up within three weeks by no less than seventy-eight men. The remarkable part of it was that the gentleman who gave up the farm happened to be the Board of Agriculture correspondent for the district, and he had reported that by far the greater portion of the land in the locality was totally unsuitable for small holdings. He could mention several other counties in the East of England where the demand for small holdings was not satisfied. In the Isle of Ely all the land was suitable for small holdings, and yet only 15 per cent. of it was occupied by small cultivators. He knew a case where forty labourers were provided with allotments under the 1894 Act, and the movement had extended until to-day there were 120 persons, principally labourers, occupying small holdings varying in size from four to sixteen acres. On those holdings thirty-seven new cottages had been erected, and, besides, many other buildings had been rebuilt or enlarged. Surely those facts ought to dispel any fear as to the success of the movement in that particular district. The same might be said with respect to Leicestershire. While taking part in the recent county council election in Leicestershire he spoke on the small holdings question, and fired with enthusiasm one of the candidates who succeeded in winning a seat. That gentleman had lately written to him as follows—

> "I spent last night at Newbold amongst the men and was agreeably surprised. I find that most of them have got a little money and although colliers are keen to have a bit of land. All have had farm experience and can milk. There are five men already keeping cows although they have not a yard of land. They put them out to agistment in the summer and buy hay and roots for them in the winter."

This was useful as showing that not only arable land, but grass land was required. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin had said that in his district small holdings had been the rule for thirty years, and that the system had not stopped depopulation. When the right hon. Gentleman was speaking, he interposed the remark that the small holdings in the western counties were not 15 per cent. of the whole of the agricultural land, and the retort was that the land was not suitable for small holdings.

Mr. WALTER LONG said it was quite obvious what he meant. He meant that small holdings had from time immemorial existed in his part of England where the land was suitable. Experiments such as those to which the hon. Gentleman had been referring would not be successful if tried on Salisbury Plain.

*Mr. WINFREY said that was why the right hon. Gentleman should not have used the argument that it did not stop depopulation in his district.

Mr. WALTER LONG: Not at all. If the land was divided into one-third which was suitable for small holdings, and two-thirds which were not suitable, it would be found that depopulation had gone on as much in one part as in the other.

*Mr. WINFREY said the right hon. Gentleman's experience was quite the opposite of his own, and as he had challenged anyone to give evidence that small holdings had stopped the rural exodus, he would take up the challenge. In 1881 the census was taken of the population in nineteen parishes in South Lincolnshire—that was before the allotment movement had got a start—and the next census was taken in 1891. The falling off in the population in that decade in those parishes was 2,280. The Allotments Act did not come into operation until 1890, and the Small Holdings Act until 1892. Operations were also commenced under the Parish Councils Act of 1894. In the same parishes during the decade from 1891 to 1901 the decrease in the population was only 115. He ventured to say that when the census was taken in 1911 those parishes would show an increase of population. That was entirely due to the development of allotments and small holdings, and therefore he heartily welcomed this Bill, for he was certain that other districts throughout England could do as well as they had done in Lincolnshire.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said they had had a very long speech from the hon. Member who had just sat down. Some of it was very interesting, but a great deal of it was unnecessary under the circumstances. The hon. Member seemed to take as his theme the necessity of proving to the House that the Bill, which would facilitate the creation of small holdings, was opposed on the Opposition side of the House. There was no reason why any such attack should have been directed against them.

MR. WINFREY: I said there are exceptions.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY did not think the hon. Member said that there were exceptions. The hon. Member had no justification whatever for his attack on the Opposition, and with his extremely limited knowledge of land he should be careful how he made unpleasant attacks on those who had spent their lives trying to understand the subject. He understood from the right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill that his desire was to facilitate the creation of small holdings and allotments, but his right hon. friend, in his reply, had made it plain that there would not be much difference of opinion on the two sides of the House as to that object, though there was a difference of opinion as to the way in which it was to be attained. It was on that point, after all, that discussion was most likely to be useful. Several hon. Members had spoken as if the chief object of the Bill was to arrest the progress of rural depopulation, which it was contended was mainly due to the abstraction from the land of the rural labourer. There were other descriptions of labour employed on great estates, in building, in drainage, and in the maintenance of the establishment. That was largely decreased when the power of landowners to live on their estates was taken away from them, and it was that which had very largely caused depopulation in many districts. The right hon. Gentleman had said that no attempt would be made by advancing loans to landlords to induce them to create small holdings of their own accord. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman had made a mistake in that respect. The object of increasing such holdings, properly equipped and let at reasonable rents, would be attained more rapidly by facilitating their creation in the way he had suggested than by setting them up through public bodies or by spending money through those bodies. Without destroying the Bill, provision could be made for the possibility of landlords themselves being able to take up the loans for the purpose of creating small holdings. In that event he believed that better tenants would be selected than by public bodies, that the land would be let at a smaller cost, and that the loss, if any, would fall on the landlords and not upon the ratepayers. It was a matter of common knowledge amongst those familiar with rural life that the owners of land were long suffering, helpful to their tenants, and kind to the poor among them when bad times came. That would be impossible in the case of public bodies, which would stand in quite a different relationship to the tenants. It would be their duty to the ratepayers to insist on rents being punctually paid, and in times of illness or distress they would not be able to show the same consideration as private landlords. What would be the position of the public bodies? The land having been acquired, buildings would have to be erected, and the occupier would have to pay the full rent plus the interest on the loan, and thus would be in a position comparing unfavourably with his neighbour. That would be the subject of grievance and difficulty. It was a grave responsibility to try to withdraw a man from well-paid labour and the assistance he could get from a friendly landlord in order that he might set up a small holding. There were several questions of detail on which he wished to touch. As he understood it the loan was to be repaid, principal and interest, in eighty years; but if the holding became vacant at the end of a fourteen years lease, who would be responsible for the unpaid portion of the loan? The success of small holdings depended very largely on the surroundings and the industries of the locality, and if such experiments as had been made were investigated he thought it would be found that success of the smallholder depended upon the individual, and was due also to the fact that he had the means of supplementing his earnings by some other work or by hiring his horse. If there was a class in the country to whom it was of importance to make the condition of the rural people happier, it was the landlord class. Those who lived on their land would know all the conditions and the surroundings, and could calculate the chances of success or failure for the small holder. There were hundreds of thousands of acres of light land where the experiment of small holdings was doomed to failure. It would be very easy to find faults with the Bill, but he would reserve a good many of his criticisms for a later stage. He assumed, however, that the introduction of the Bill implied the withdrawal of the Scottish Small Holders Bill. It would be an extraordinary position if both measures were proceeded with, because they set up different principles and different modes of procedure applicable to different parts of the island where exactly the same conditions prevailed. When the Bill was printed he would consider it, not in a hostile mood, but with an earnest desire to understand and appreciate its merits, if it should turn out to be a fair-minded effort to establish a system of tenure which many landlords had done their best to promote.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL (Sir W. ROBSON, South Shields) said the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken had said that there was no opposition in the House to small holdings, and he welcomed that statement: indeed it was one which went no further than he expected. He thought at that stage it was well to look for any common ground of agreement that had been disclosed by the debate. Both sides of the House were agreed that an increase of small holdings was desirable, and he thought they were also agreed that such an increase was a proper object of direct action by the State. That also had been proved by the antecedent legislation of both Parties, to which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Bordesley Division had referred. Whatever was the value of the antecedent legislation, it at least showed that both sides, all Parties in the House, were of opinion that this was a proper subject for some national effort. He was surprised that some Members, including the right hon. Member for Bordesley, were apparently contented with the state of existing legislation. [Mr. COLLINGS dissented.] The Acts of 1887 and 1892 were clearly and obviously failures. [Mr. COLLINGS: Not at all.] The Act of 1887, for instance, as far as the compulsory clauses were concerned, had resulted in sixteen acres, and there were less than 1,000 acres purchased by agreement. The results of hiring by agreement were little better, and taking everyone of the transactions from 1883 up to 1892 about 3,000 acres were dealt with; but when they come to the Act of 1894, which had been unfavourably compared with former Acts, under it 15,000 acres had been dealt with, and 30,000 tenants put upon the land. Those results he took from official figures. It was said that the Acts of 1887 and 1892 had led up to those agreements, but let him ask the House to consider why the Acts of 1887 and 1892 were such failures. The Act of 1887 was a failure because the whole administration was in the hands of district councils who were notoriously antipathetic to allotments generally. Then when the matter came into the hands of the county councils they had to go through an expensive procedure involving a public inquiry, and the system of the transfer of property was one of the most cumbrous ever devised by the wit of man. That was not by any means the end, because, under the Act of 1887, after the county council had passed the provisional order, the Local Government Board came on the scene and had to pass a Bill to confirm the provisional order. Could anyone wonder that no more than sixteen acres only were obtained? The Act of 1887 had proved a failure because of the costly and cumbrous nature of the proceedings; and the Act of 1892 was a failure because it avoided compulsion altogether, and left the operation of the measure to voluntary agencies and the option of the county councils, which when left alone were not very friendly to either allotments or small holdings. They were responsible for 800 acres under the Act of 1892, which was not a very promising state of things. From the failure of those two Acts the Government had learnt two lessons—first, that any legislation must provide a simple and cheap procedure; and, secondly, that the administration must be entrusted to people who were sympathetic with the object. Those were the two main purposes the Government had in view. Then the preliminary inquiry should be made as cheap as possible, and the Government had taken the cost of such inquiries off the particular transaction between the county council and the tenant. That was a great relief to the tenant, because, under the Acts of 1887 and 1892, the cost fell upon the tenant, and it was almost impossible for anyone to proceed under any such conditions. It was only just and fair to limit the cost that the tenant had to incur to the commercial aspect of the transaction. The rates would, according to the Bill, be very carefully guarded, though there would be a small expenditure incurred by the Exchequer, mainly for the salaries of officials. The right hon. Gentleman for South Dublin had asked who was going to bear the loss of the constant depreciation in cases where holdings deteriorated in value owing to the operations of the tenant. He thought his right hon. friend had made it quite clear that it was the county councils. That was a very great safeguard both to the landlord and to the tenant. With regard to the power of the Commissioners to borrow money and to impose loans on the county councils, the Commissioners had no direct and explicit power to borrow under the Act either on their own or anyone else's behalf.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said, it was a pity that in this debate there should have been such a great amount of rivalry between the two Parties as to which in the past had done most to promote the establishment of small holdings and allotments. He did not think that the right hon. Gentleman who introduced the Bill had made that a point, but the hon. Member for South West Norfolk had endeavoured to show how little the Conservative Party had contributed in the past towards providing small holdings, while the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down had gone the length of quoting a great many figures which he (Lord Willoughby de Eresby) did not think proved very much. But, after all, a little practical experience on these matters was worth something, for he had always discovered that as soon as an Act of Parliament was passed on a subject such as that with which the present Bill dealt, Members went down to their constituencies and one side would say that the Bill was of very little use, and the other would declare that it was the charter of freedom of the agricultural labourer, that they were all going to get allotments, and were all going to do wonders with them. It had always been his experience that as soon as legislation of that kind was passed there was a number of applications for small holdings. It had occurred in his own case when a Bill had been passed, and he had always been very pleased to fall in with the wishes of the workmen who made the applications. But after a while, when the interest had subsided, one saw that the allotments began to be given up. In his own case, and he was sure that it was the same in many others, a number of the small holders had fallen out, and the land was held by a few instead of by a large number. Personally he believed that the Bill would have the effect of increasing the number of applications for small holdings in certain parts of the country, but he believed, also, that, as soon as the talk about the Bill had ceased they would go back to exactly the same state of affairs as before. The hon. Member for South-West Norfolk had quoted the case of Lincolnshire. He thought that no man had taken a keener interest in this question than the hon. Gentleman, and he knew perfectly well that in several instances the hon. Member had been very successful in his experiments with small holdings. There could be no doubt that he had looked wisely into the matter, and had chosen land that was suitable for small holdings. But where he thought the Bill would break down was that, while it was true that a certain number of big farms could be turned into small holdings sucessfully, yet those were cases in which there were buildings to accommodate the tenants, or some of them. Besides the instance of successful experiments in Lincolnshire, there was the case of the hon. Member for Newmarket, who he believed had taken one of the large farms in his district and cut it up into small holdings, which had turned out very successfully. But it was to be noted that in none of those instances did the success take the form of bringing people back to the land, and that was the whole crux of the matter. It was perfectly easy to turn a farm into small holdings, but they must have houses for the tenants to live in. If there were houses already in existence the thing could be carried out; but the moment they had to build houses, to provide accommodation for the stock, and to furnish all the implements and the one hundred and one things necessary to the equipment of a holding, they were met with the difficulty of the great initial cost which people could not afford to pay. It was not the experience of local bodies alone, but of landlords and others with knowledge of these matters, that, where small holdings had been successful, in almost every instance it was found that there were buildings for the accommodation of the tenants. The right hon. Gentleman in introducing the Bill had said that he did not believe that certain farmers would approve of it, but that they would be wrong to disapprove of it because the measure would help to keep people on the land. He did not think that the right hon. Gentleman was very sanguine of getting more people back to the land; in fact, he had said that what they wanted was to keep on the land the people who were there now. He had also stated that farmers ought not to object to small holdings because, by their agency, they would have their labourers at hand. A large number of farmers, however, had stated to him that the labourers with small holdings were absolutely useless to them, because they were always most busy with their holdings when the work on the farms was at greatest pressure, and at the very moment when the farmers most needed their services. He did not himself think that the Bill would in any way help the farmer in respect of providing him with labourers. He knew that the hon. Member for Preston objected to anything in the way of subsidised industries, because it would be a bounty, according to him, and break through the blessed rules of free trade. He had always believed himself that if they wanted to get more people back to the land they would have to devise something acceptable to the owners of the land, and something acceptable to the farmers and labourers of the country generally, instead of spending money on wild-cat schemes like that now proposed, which might succeed in some instances where the building difficulty did not present itself. If they wanted allotments and small holdings to succeed, why did they not in some way, out of Government funds, provide money for the building of houses in the country in order to assist their object? If they went to the landlords of the country and said, "Give us half an acre of land, free of charge, and we will put up the cottage, for which of course a rent will be charged," he believed that in hundreds of cases the landlords would give them free of charge the sites for the erection of cottages. Such a scheme would have a far greater effect in keeping people on the land than the present proposal. One of the causes of rural depopulation was the fact that labourers' cottages were frequently so bad. If some such principle as that were adopted he believed they would be doing far more good than by spending such large sums of money in Scotland and England upon schemes which he did not believe would be a success, and were economically unsound. The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies had informed them that they were going to have a Bill under which an authority in London would supply the ginger for the small holdings. The noble Lord the President of the Board of Agriculture was to provide the ginger, but who was going to find the sugar? If county councils were forced to hire land for allotments and small holdings he felt sure that ultimately they would be thrown upon their hands. In that case

*Lord Willoughby de Eresby.*

who would have to make good the loss? The Solicitor-General had told them that the county councils would be responsible, but in case a scheme proved to be a failure they would have to fall back on the rates. In other words that meant that the neighbouring land would have to bear a rate of 2s. or 3s. in order to make good the loss. Such losses ought to fall not upon the local rates but upon the public exchequer. Although he did not intend to oppose this Bill as a whole, he believed that a universal system of small holdings would not be successful until they were placed under a system of peasant proprietors or some other form of ownership. A man was sure to work harder as an owner than as a tenant, and there were many troubles which he would overcome as an owner which he would not overcome as a tenant. Unless it was in those particular districts which were adapted for growing early potatoes or fruit farming, or some other special form of cultivation, he did not believe that small holdings were economically sound, and if they attempted to produce meat and corn upon small holdings he did not believe they would be successful. In producing corn in this country they had to compete against the whole world. How did they grow corn in Canada and the Western States of America? Did they divide the land up in small holdings? Certainly not. They ploughed towards the horizon, and there was nothing wasted. In ploughing three or four acres in this country the farmer had to turn his plough round thirty or forty times where the Canadian farmer only had to turn it once.

*MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme) said he should not have intervened at all in the debate but for some words which had fallen from the Prime Minister at Question time. There was only this week left to them to influence the Government in what might prove a critical session, and he for one did not mean to allow the chance to pass. In his opinion this Bill could not be a success unless it was preceded by a Valuation Bill. What was the machinery suggested for purchasing the land? It had to be purchased by the county council from private landowners, after certain expensive preliminaries, and upon the decision of a single arbitrator. The arbitrator had to decide between the local landlord and the public purse. The local landlord was generally a popular and influential person. Under those circumstances human nature would not be what it was if the landlord did not get the best of the bargain. Everybody knew what happened when a landlord went to arbitration with a public body or corporation in regard to the price to be paid for a piece of land. When a railway company or a public body obtained compulsory powers to purchase land and compelled a landlord to sell even a piece of land for a small bridge or a siding, the landlord generally asked about ten times as much as it was worth and he often succeeded in getting five times more than its proper value. Hon. Members knew that that was what invariably happened. He did not wonder that the Bill had been received fairly well by hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, because it seemed to him to be very largely a landlord's endowment Bill. After the land had been bought, it was to be parcelled out among the unfortunate small holders. [Cries of "Divide."] There was no division. This Bill was welcomed by the other side. No one need stop. If the land was bought in that way, and taken up by the small holders at the enhanced price, and if they had to pay a sinking fund to clear off all the charges in respect of land and buildings in eighty years, a fourth of them would be bound to go bankrupt before very long, and as soon as they went bankrupt the whole of the loss on the experiment fell on the rates. They would avoid all that if they produced a scheme which based the purchase price on a general uniform valuation all over the country. If they did that, they would be able to buy land at a price which might enable the small holder to make it pay. Personally, he should urge upon hon. Members that by far the best way of dealing with the question of small holdings, and getting the land used properly, was to have an entire reform of the system of local taxation. Until the rates were based, not on improvements as now, but on the unimproved value of land, they could not hope to get the land used in the best possible way. If they based the rates on the unimproved value, they would induce landlords to use the land in the best possible way. It was only by bringing the landlord to the tenant, and not the tenant to the landlord, that they could hope to solve this question.

*MR. HUNT said he agreed with the hon. Gentleman opposite that there was a great demand for small holdings in the country. His experience was that a working man would very much rather rent land than buy it. So far as ordinary allotments were concerned, he certainly thought that there should be compulsion to provide them at a reasonable price under fair conditions. It must, however, be remembered that in providing allotments there would have to be provision for houses, buildings, fences, and water supply. The moment a man got a small holding he was faced with the difficulty of providing these necessary things. The hon. Member for the Newton division did not say in his excellent speech whether, in connection with the cases to which he referred, buildings had been provided, or whether the tenants of the land merely took houses which were close by. The question of new houses, buildings, fences and water supply was at the bottom of this matter of providing small holdings. What was going to happen in regard to the buildings on a large farm for which large buildings had been especially erected after half the land had been taken and parcelled out in small holdings? That was a question which had to be considered. But the biggest difficulty, after all, was that they could not get labourers back on the land under present conditions, because they could not provide land and buildings at a price which would pay even two per cent. That was the difficulty which the Government had got to face, and unless they faced it, they were bound to get into a mess over the Bill. He knew that there was a great yearning among agricultural labourers for small holdings, and he should be only too delighted to provide small holdings if it were possible to do so, but it could not be done under present conditions. The difficulty was that people did not get enough money for their produce to enable them to pay the rates and taxes and the rent which would be required for the interest on the necessary outlay. The produce of other parts of the world was coming into this country without any taxation at all. He would put it in this way. All the things we produced from the land in this country, from a bullock to an egg, were very heavily taxed because the land was very heavily taxed. All foreign nations with their cheap land and cheap labour were actually given a bounty through the free entrance of their products into this country. Could agriculture be expected to flourish in this country when subjected to these hopelessly unfair conditions?

*MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire), considered that the system of purchase would not work satisfactorily unless it were preceded by a measure for the reform of valuation and rating, which would bring the cost of land down to its fair market price. If that were not done the prices would remain too high, and the burden would ultimately fall on those who had to repay it by instalments, while the plan would also have its usefulness impaired by the fact that as soon as a man improved his property the valuation and the rates would be raised against him. What was needed in the first instance to secure to our producers fair play as compared with their foreign competitors was that they should be able to obtain the land on reasonable terms and be assured that their rates would not be raised against them in consequence of their improvements.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Harcourt, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Burns, Sir Edward Strachey, Mr. Lambert, and Mr. Solicitor-General.

## SMALL HOLDINGS AND ALLOTMENTS BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Small Holdings and Allotments," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 212.]

## MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

## PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY (No. 2) BILL.

Read a second time and committed to a Standing Committee.

Whereupon Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House, without Question put, pursuant to the Standing Order.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve o'clock.

# HOUSE OF LORDS.

*Tuesday, 28th May,* 1907.

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) [H.L.]; Tramways Orders Confirmation [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 2) [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 4) [H.L.]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4).

Also the certificate that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in respect of the petition for the following Bill:—Alton Military Hospital.

Also that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in respect of the petition for additional provision in the following Bill:—Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water [H.L.].

And also the certificates from the examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with:—Great Northern and City Railway.

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Harrison's Patent Bill [H.L.]; General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, Bill [H.L.]; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [H.L.]; North British Railway Bill [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.], now Coventry Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Midland Railway Bill [H.L.]. Read $3^{a}$, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, etc.) Bill [H.L.]; Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. Committed.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill; Leeds Corporation Bill; London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill; King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill; London and North-Western Railway Bill; London United Tramways Bill; Penrith Urban District Council Bill. Brought from the Commons, read $1^{a}$, and referred to the Examiners.

Baines' Name Bill [H.L.]; Borax Consolidated Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [H.L.]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with amendments: The said amendments considered, and agreed to.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Newquay and District Water Bill [H.L]. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with amendments.

Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill. Returned from the Commons with the Amendments agreed to.

Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited, Order Confirmation Bill. Brought from the Commons, read $1^{a}$; to be printed; and (pursuant to the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act 1899), deemed to have been read $2^{a}$. (The Lord Hamilton of Dalzell), and reported from the Committee. (No. 57.)

## *PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).*

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the following Papers, having been commanded to be presented to this House by His Majesty, had been so presented on the following dates by delivery to the Clerk of the Parliaments, pursuant to Standing Order No. CXI., viz.—

### TRADE REPORTS—I. ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3791. France (Cherbourg). (17th May.)

No. 3792. Russia (Rostov-on-Don). (22nd May.)

No. 3793. United States (States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho).

*An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.*

No. 3794. United States (New York).

No. 3795. Italy (Finances).

No. 3796. Germany.

No. 3797. Russia.

No. 3798. Turkey (Beirut and Coast of Syria). (23rd May.)

No. 3799. Italy (Lombardy). (24th May.)

No. 3800. China (Wuhu).

No. 3801. China (Hankow).

No. 3802. China (Nanking).

No. 3803. Japan (North Formosa). (25th May.)

### II. MISCELLANEOUS SERIES.

No. 660. Japanese Paper Mills. (23rd May.)

### BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

I. Annual Report of proceedings under the Tithe Acts, 1836 to 1891, the Copyhold Act, 1894, the Inclosure Acts, 1845 to 1899, the Agricultural Holdings Acts, 1883 to 1900, the Drainage and Improvement of Land Acts, the Universities and College Estates Acts, 1858 to 1898, the Glebe Lands Act, 1888, and certain other Acts, for the year 1906. (17th May.)

II. Memorandum by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries upon the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 1907 (H.L. No. 24). (22nd May.)

### BOARD OF EDUCATION.

I. (List of Public Elementary Schools, England).---List of Public elementary schools and certified efficient schools in England (excluding Monmouthshire) on 1st August, 1906. (22nd May.)

II. (County of Cornwall.—Endowed Charities (Elementary Education). Report made to the Board of Education in the result of an inquiry into endowments subject to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894, and appropriated in whole or in part to purposes of elementary education in the County of Cornwall, or in any part thereof. (24th May.)

III. (Special Reports, Volume 17). —Special reports on educational subjects, Volume 17. Schools, public and private, in the North of Europe.

IV. (Secondary Schools).—Summary of figures relating to state-aided secondary schools in England (excluding Wales and Monmouthshire), together with a memorandum on the management and character of those schools in respect of public control and freedom from denominational restrictions. (25th May.)

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

I. Thirty-fourth Annual Report, by the Accountant for Scotland, to the Scottish Education Department. (22nd May.)

II. Report of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, with Appendix (1906–1907). (24th May.)

### CONGESTION IN IRELAND (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Fourth Report of the Commissioners, with Appendix (Minutes of evidence taken in London, 14th to 23rd February, 1907, and documents relating thereto). (22nd May.)

### ALIENS ACT, 1905.

Return of Alien passengers brought to the United Kingdom from ports in Europe or within the Mediterranean Sea during the three months ended 31st March, 1906, together with the number of expulsion orders made during that period requiring aliens to leave the United Kingdom. (22nd May.)

### EMIGRATION.

Memorandum on the history and functions of the Emigrants' Information Office. (22nd May.)

### TREATY SERIES, NO. 13 (1907).

Treaty between the United Kingdom and Peru for the mutual surrender of fugitive criminals, signed at Lima, 26th January, 1904 (ratifications exchanged at Lima, 30th November, 1906). (23rd May.)

### LUNACY (SCOTLAND) ACT.

Forty-ninth Annual Report of the General Board of Commissioners in Lunacy for Scotland. (24th May.)

### TRADE.

Annual statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with foreign countries and British Possessions, 1906, compared with the four preceding years: Volume II. (Abstract and detailed tables of trade with each country and at each port) and miscellaneous tables. (24th May.)

### ARMY.

Additional Estimate of the cost of the Territorial Force (in continuation of [Cd. 3296]). (24th May.)

### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT, 1906 (INDUSTRIAL DISEASES).

Order, dated 22nd May, 1907, made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department in pursuance of Section 8 (6) of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, extending the provisions of the Act to certain industrial diseases. (25th May.)

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

---

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

---

### NATIONAL GALLERY, IRELAND.

Report of the Director to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1906.

### COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.

Minutes of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 1907.

Papers laid before the Colonial Conference, 1907.

### TRADE REPORTS, ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3804. Spain (Galicia, the Asturias, and Leon, 1906).

No. 3805. France (Nantes, 1906).

### NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Fiftieth Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery 1906–1907.

### FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1905; Part II. Scientific Investigations.

### BANKING AND RAILWAY STATISTICS (IRELAND).

December, 1906.

### IRISH LAND COMMISSION.

Returns of advances made under the Irish Land Act, 1903—During the month of July, 1906.

During the month of October, 1906.

During the month of November, 1906.

### BANN AND LOUGH NEAGH DRAINAGE.

Report to the Lord-Lieutenant, by Mr. J. D. Bell, land valuer, appointed by Government to make certain valuations in connection with Sir Alexander Binnie's Report on the Bann and Lough Neagh Drainage.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1875.

Order in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, amending the Order in Council of 28th July, 1893, relating to the Circuits of the Judges, and revoking the Order in Council of 1st March, 1907.

### FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Order in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, entitled "The Persian Coast and Islands Order in Council, 1907."

### GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 AND 1869.

Order in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, sanctioning a further re-arrangement of Greenwich Hospital Pensions.

### EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1906.

Order in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, for giving effect to a Treaty of Extradition between His Majesty and the President of the Republic of Peru.

### NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.

Orders in Council, dated 7th May, 1907, sanctioning—The extension of the system of repayment of cost of forwarding baggage to officers appointed from, or discharged to, half-pay.

The repayment of expenses for subsistence to candidates for entry into His Majesty's Navy, subject to certain conditions.

### DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Order dated 17th May, 1907, entitled the Glasgow Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1907.

### FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

(Homework)—Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of sections 107, 108, and 110 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and revoking the Order of the 15th August, 1905.

(Particulars of Piece Work Wages)—Two Orders made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying with modifications the provisions of section 116 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, to non-textile factories and workshops in which certain classes of industries are carried on, and to out-workers employed in those industries.

## PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE MARKS.

Twenty-fourth Report of the Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks, with Appendices, for the year 1906.

## ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION ACTS, 1881 AND 1892.

Forty-third Annual Report on Alkali, etc., Works, by the Chief Inspector; proceedings during the year 1906.

## LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL.

Return showing, up to 31st March, 1907:—

I. The amount of Consolidated Stock; The application of the money raised by such stock; The sums carried to the Consolidated Loans Fund; The application of the Consolidated Loans Fund; An estimate of the expenditure of the Council for all purposes, for the year ending 31st March, 1908.

II. All moneys raised by the Metropolitan Board of Works and the Council since the passing of the Act for the purposes mentioned in the Act; Particulars in relation to every parish, district, union, or place in respect whereof a loan has been obtained from the Metropolitan Board of Works or the Council since the passing of the Act.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

## MEDWAY CONSERVANCY.

Statement of receipts and expenditure by the conservators of the River Medway, for the year ended 25th March, 1907: Delivered (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

## MERCHANT SHIPPING ACTS AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, the object of this Bill is simply to remedy an omission in the existing law. It does not introduce any new principle at law, or alter or modify any existing principle. It merely extends to owners of lighters, barges, and like vessels the same protection as is given to shipowners.

Second 502 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, provides that no owner of any sea-going ship shall be liable to make good any loss or damage that may happen without his actual fault or privity (1) of or to any goods or merchandise by reason of fire happening on board such ship, and (2) of or to certain valuable articles specified in that section. By Section 503 of the same Act and Section 1 of the Merchant Shipping (Liability of Shipowners and others) Act, 1900, the liability of owners of "ships," which expression does not include lighters or barges, is limited to £15 per ton of the ship's tonnage in respect of loss of life or personal injury, and to £8 per ton of the ship's tonnage where—

> "any loss or damage is caused to property or rights of any kind, and whether on land or on water, or whether fixed or moveable."

There is no statute limiting the liability of owners of lighters, barges, and like vessels in any way; and they are therefore liable, though subject to similar risks as shipowners, for the whole amount of the loss or damage, whereas the shipowners' liability is limited. A Bill which contained provisions to remedy this injustice, intituled the Barge Owners, &c., Liability Bill, was referred to a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1892, and Clause 1 of the present Bill in effect reproduces the clause as amended by the Committee of 1892, limiting barge-owners' liability. Certain other clauses which appeared in the Bill have been omitted as subsequent legislation has rendered them unnecessary, and provision has been made to preserve the existing rights of persons employed in lighters and barges.

The unfairness of the present law consists in the differentiation that is made between barges which are capable of being propelled by sails and those which have no sails. The former are already protected under the Merchant Shipping Act, but barges which have no sails, and which are known as dumb barges, are not protected in the same way. There is no reason that I can find for the distinction, as both classes of vessels do the same work and are exposed to the same risks. I could give your Lordships instances if it were necessary to do so, but I hardly think they are called for at this stage. These dumb barges, which are known by other names in various places, are craft varying in size from 20 to 200 tons burthen. Your Lordships will therefore see that except in the matter of the means of propulsion, the vessels are very much of the same order and the same size.

One question which I think will occur to your Lordships to ask is how this inequality of treatment has arisen. I have been at some pains to endeavour to ascertain the cause, and I cannot find that there is any, except this. When the limitation of liability was given to shipowners many years ago there was no association for the protection of the interests of bargeowners, and therefore no steps were taken on their behalf. So far as I have been able to find out, that is the only reason why dumb barges are not included in the definition of "ships" in the Merchant Shipping Acts. To the best of my belief no objection is taken in any quarter to the principle of this Bill, and I believe that if the session of 1892 had been longer the Bill of that year would have been passed into law. The clauses of the Bill do not, I think, require any explanation at the present moment, but if your Lordships are good enough to give the Bill a Second Reading some little explanation may be necessary at a further stage.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, before your Lordships give a Second Reading to this Bill I would like to say one or two words with regard to it. A sailing barge may be of 100 tons burthen, but it is under control, having a sufficient number of men on board. But one frequently sees large dumb barges on the Thames with only one man on board. He is entirely at the mercy of the current, and though he does his best with a large pair of sweeps, when the tide sets in near the shore he has to let go the sweeps, and when he gets alongside either a wharf or a vessel he takes a turn of a rope and holds on till the barge gets the right swing. It is quite impossible for one man to control a barge of anything like 200 tons, and the process by which the attempt to do so is made leads to very considerable damage to vessels. I would therefore suggest to the noble Lord in charge of the Bill, that at the Committee stage he should accept an Amendment making the extension of this protection only applicable to barges that have at least two men on board.

*LORD INVERCLYDE: My Lords, I am sorry to differ from the noble Lord who introduced this Bill, but I think barges and ships are not on all fours. To begin with, the measurement of the tonnage on which the liability is limited is on a different basis. Again, I do not understand that the owners of barges are willing to come under all the rules and regulations which the owners of steamers and sailing vessels have to submit to before they can obtain the advantage of this limitation of liability. As your Lordships know, steamers have to undergo a number of Board of Trade inspections and surveys, and to submit to numerous restrictions with regard to manning, to loadline, and so on; and I do not understand that barges will come under any of those restrictions. I do not see, therefore, that it is fair to put them on the same basis as ships, which, before obtaining this limitation of liability, have to pass through all these different surveys. At all events, I feel very strongly that barges which only navigate inland waters ought not to get the benefit of this limitation, and that barges on estuaries ought to be subject to proper control. At the present time on the Thames, the Mersey, and such estuaries barges drift about in a manner which is dangerous to the navigation of steamers, and I therefore hope that when the Bill reaches the Committee stage your Lordships will amend it very considerably in this direction.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, since this Bill has been down for Second Reading we have received at the

Board of Trade evidence of a certain amount of opposition to it, especially from people who represent the coasting class of vessels. They submit to us—and I think with a certain amount of strength—that since the Committee of 1892 these dumb barges have increased enormously in size, and that whereas they used to carry about fifty tons of material, they now frequently carry 300 tons, and are not infrequently built of iron. Therefore if one of these barges not under control runs into a vessel it does a considerable amount of harm, and the question of limiting the liability in the case of this class of vessel is, I think, a very serious one. I would suggest, if your Lordships agree to give the Bill a Second Reading, that the whole matter should be referred to a Select Committee of your Lordships' House before we proceed further with the Bill. I may say that Clause 2, which deals with the question of tonnage, would have to be very carefully considered before we could assent to the proposition contained in the Bill.

LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, I very gladly assent to the course proposed by the noble Earl who represents the Board of Trade. In view of the objections, which I may say are entirely new to me, I think it very advisable that the Bill should be examined more carefully and critically than is possible in Committee of the whole House. With your Lordships' permission I should like to say, in reply to the noble Lord on my left (Lord Inverclyde), who criticised the Bill somewhat severely, that he ignored the very point which I endeavoured to make clear —namely, that already a large class of barges have this limitation of liability. The noble Lord assumed that barges would not submit to the regulations which are an indispensable condition of limitation of liability, but sailing barges are already classed as ships and treated in the same manner.

On Question, Bill read $2^a$.

Moved, "That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at a quarter before Five o'clock, till to-morrow, Two o'clock.

*The Earl of Granard.*

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Tuesday, 28th May,* 1907.

The House met a quarter before Three of the Clock.

## PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

### PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have not been complied with, viz.:—Selsey Water Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

### PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:—Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time to-morrow.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [Lords]; Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill [Lords]; St. Neot's Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

## *PETITIONS.*

### EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS) BILL.

Petition from Dewsbury, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Dunnottar; Kilrenny; Newburgh; Perth; and Rothes; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against, from Cambridge (three); Edmonton; Hammersmith; Harlow; Hornsey; South Croydon; Southsea; and Tintagel; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Merthyr Tydvil, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

### SMALL HOLDINGS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Perth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table..

### VACCINATION ACTS.

Petition from Eastbourne, for repeal; to lie upon the Table.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (HOMEWORK).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108, and 110 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and revoking the Order of the 15th August, 1905 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (PARTICULARS OF PIECE WORK WAGES).

Copies presented, of Two Orders made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying with modifications the provisions of Section 116 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, to Non-Textile Factories and Workshops in which certain classes of industries are carried on, and to outworkers employed in those industries [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3804 and 3805 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### FISHERIES (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland on the Sea and Inland Fisheries of Ireland for 1905, Part II., Scientific Investigations [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### RENTS AND ROYALTIES ARISING FROM MINES UNDER THE SEA.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 16th May; *Mr. George Roberts*]; to lie upon the Table.

### DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS, 1894 TO 1903.

Copy presented, of an Order dated 17th May, 1907, entitled the Glasgow Foreign Animals Wharf Order of 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### EXTRADITION ACTS, 1870 TO 1895.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 7th May, 1907, for giving effect to a Treaty of Extradition between His Majesty and the President of the Republic of Peru [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 7th May, 1907, entitled The Persian Coast and Islands Order in Council, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1875.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 7th May, 1907, amending the Order in Council of 28th July, 1893, relating to the Circuits of the Judges, and revoking the Order in Council of 1st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### GREENWICH HOSPITAL ACTS, 1865 AND 1869.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 7th May, 1907, sanctioning a further rearrangement of Greenwich Hospital Pensions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### NAVAL AND MARINE PAY AND PENSIONS ACT, 1865.

Copies presented, of Orders in Council dated 7th May, 1907, sanctioning: 1. The extension of the system of repayment of cost of forwarding baggage to Officers appointed from or discharged to Half-Pay; 2. The repayment of expenses for subsistence to Candidates for entry into His Majesty's Navy subject to certain conditions [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### EAST INDIA (STATE PRISONERS).

Address for "Return of all State prisoners in India and Burmah, giving the date of their imprisonment and the grounds of their imprisonment."—(*Mr. Morton.*)

---

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

---

### The Dock Book.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty the date of the last edition of the Dock Book giving particulars of the docks and ships of the world; what is the last date of the Appendix of Corrections to the Dock Book; whether a new edition is in preparation; and whether he will supply a copy to the library.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The present edition of the Dock Book was published in 1905, and an Appendix will probably be issued early in 1908. A copy has been furnished to the library.

### Assistant Engineers in the Navy.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that all assistant engineers entering the Navy for temporary services were supplied with a circular saying that they would be treated in all respects as assistant engineers on the permanent list entering from Keyham College, and like them would be promoted on passing a qualifying examination after six years service; whether under the memorandum of 1903 the position of engineer officers was improved as regards promotion, so as to assimilate it with that of executive officers; whether he will state why the accelerated rate of promotion, according to which the engineer officers on the permanent list are promoted after three years, has not been extended to the officers entered for temporary service; and whether, if necessary, an Order in Council could be introduced in order to effect this.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The regulations which were supplied to these officers on entry did not contain any statement to this effect. They stated—(a) that "an assistant engineer for temporary service who passes the necessary examination will be promoted to the rank of engineer on the permanent list after six years service provided that his conduct as regards zeal and ability has been in all respects satisfactory; (b) engineers promoted from the list of assistant engineers for temporary service will be treated in all respects as other engineers, except as to counting junior service." It is a fact that under the memorandum of 1903 the position of engineer officers as regards promotion was improved, but it was not considered either necessary or desirable to extend these concessions to assistant engineers for temporary service, the six years being treated as a period of probation in their case. It is not, therefore, proposed to obtain authority for any change in the regulations under which these officers entered.

### Dog Licence Case at Leigh Petty Sessional Court.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the cases of the two farmers named Thomas Leigh and John William Lee, who appeared before the Leigh Petty Sessional Court, on 7th March, on charges of having made false declarations in applying for dog exemptions, and were each fined 1s. and costs, amounting in one case to 12s. 6d. and in the other to 11s. 6d., and subsequently were informed by the clerk to the magistrates that they were entitled to and would receive exemptions in due course; and, as they have in fact received them, whether the conviction would be quashed and the amounts paid in respect of fines and costs be repaid.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have inquired into the circumstances of this case, and I find that the two farmers mentioned in the Question obtained the consent of the magistrates to the grant of exemptions from licence duty for dogs by means of declarations which were afterwards shown to be false. They were prosecuted and convicted of the offence of making false declarations. The case is certainly not one in which I should feel justified in advising any remission of the penalty.

### Exclusion of Canadian Live Cattle.

MR. MOND (Chester): To ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been directed to the statement made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at the Colonial Conference, as to the exclusion of Canadian live cattle from this country; and whether, in order to promote good relations in the Empire, he will take any steps to have this prohibition removed.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) I would refer my hon. friend to the Answer given on the 13th of this month by my hon. friend the Member for South Somerset to a similar Question.† I cannot add anything to that statement.

### Condition of Factory Labour in India.

SIR ANDREW TORRANCE (Glasgow, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is able to state if Sir Hamilton Freer-Smith found the conditions of factory labour in India such as to require legislative enactment to shorten the hours of work, or did he find that the conditions were such as not to call for any legislative interference.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Report is with the Government of India, and I am in communication with that Government as to its publication at a very early date.

### Workmen's Trains from Grays and Tilbury.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he proposes to hold a local inquiry with reference to the provision of workmen's trains by the London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Company from Grays and Tilbury, in Essex, to Purfleet and London.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) No representations have been received by the Board of Trade with regard to any demand for workmen's tickets from Grays and Tilbury to London, but the Board have been in communication with the London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Company on the subject of a request for the issue of such tickets from Grays to Purfleet. The company have now expressed their willingness to issue such tickets at a return fare of 2d., the tickets to be available by the 5.39 a.m. train which is specified in the petition received.

### Workmen's Compensation Act—Casual Workmen.

MR. L. HASLAM (Monmouth Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in view of the difficulty of determining under the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act whether a workman is a casual workman or is a workman under the conditions of the Act, whether he will consider the advisability of issuing a circular showing the means by which employers, and especially employers employing workmen intermittently, may safeguard themselves by means of insurance against liabilities they may incur under the Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am having prepared for official publication a leaflet giving a synopsis of those provisions of the Act which are of general importance. I have also under consideration the question of drawing attention, by means of public notices, to the liabilities imposed upon employers by the Act, and to the desirability of insurance.

### Employment in the Building Trade.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the President of the Local Govenment Board if he will state the numbers of men engaged in the building trade during the last available period of twelve months, and during the five previous periods.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 640.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have made inquiries on this subject, but do not find that there are any official statistics giving the information desired by the hon. Member.

### Poor Relief by the New Forest Guardians.

MR. BENNETT (Oxfordshire, Woodstock): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the Local Government Board auditor, Mr. Locke, had decided in four cases that the New Forest Guardians could not give relief to an able-bodied woman with one child, although the relief was for the child; will he say what in each case were the average weekly earnings and income which the mother had, without the relief, for lodging, food, clothing, firing, and other necessaries for herself and child; what were the ages of the children; whether the mothers were widows and the children legitimate; what was the weekly amount of relief which the guardians were giving to each child before the interference of the auditor; and whether the Local Government Board have sanctioned the auditor's decision.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I have seen a reference to these cases in a newspaper, but I have not received any other information with regard to them. I will communicate with the auditor on the subject.

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Summer Naval Manœuvres.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the programme of visits of the Channel Fleet to different ports in Great Britain and Ireland is mapped out to its arrival at Portland on 29th August; and, having regard to the special circumstances of all the admirals in our four fleets being new to their commands, and from twenty-six to twenty-eight out of thirty-two battleships having changed their crews or their fleets this year, while the turbined battleship "Dreadnought" has never been tried manœuvring with fleets, whether he will state when it is proposed to hold the summer naval manœuvres in order to test the new distribution scheme.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): I have nothing to add to my reply to the hon. Member for North-West Lanark, on the 13th instant,† except that the "Dreadnought" has already been tried manœuvring with a fleet with satisfactory results.

### Royal Marines.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Report upon the Royal Marines, which was referred to by Lord Tweedmouth in his Statement issued with Navy Estimates, 1907–8, in the second paragraph of page 5 of that Statement, is yet completed; and whether he will lay the Report upon the Table of the House.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have nothing to add to my printed reply to the hon. Member for the Dulwich Division of Camberwell on the 23rd instant.‡

### Yeomanry Allowances.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can say by what sum his estimate of £2,800,000 a year for carrying out the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill will be exceeded by the various concessions he has been understood to make, namely, that the Imperial Yeomanry shall receive allowances, bringing the total receipts of each trooper up to the present standard; that walking-out and parade uniforms shall be provided in addition to the field-service uniform for each non-commissioned officer and private of the Territorial Army; and that adjutants and sergeant instructors from the Regular Army shall be attached to each unit.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): If the hon. and gallant Member will kindly refer to the Paper recently laid upon the Table (Cd. 3369) he will find a statement of the expense of all items which may have to be added to the original estimate of the cost of the Territorial Forces.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 575.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 1158–9.

### Nairobi Prison.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, when the new prison buildings at Nairobi are completed, European prisoners will be exclusively confined there and their detention at Mombasa abandoned.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The new prison at Nairobi will, no doubt, be the normal place of confinement for European prisoners, but the Secretary of State cannot undertake that such persons will never be detained at Mombasa.

MR. ASHLEY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mombasa is not at all a healthy place for Europeans who are not in prison?

MR. CHURCHILL: That ought to be an additional incentive to persons resident in the country to respect the law.

### Egyptian State Railways.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in view of the facts that the earnings of the Egyptian State railways for 1905 showed an increased return per cent. on the increased capital outlay of recent years, that many of the carriages are dilapidated and insufficiently lighted, that many of the engines are from thirty to fifty-five years old, and that the tariffs for passengers and goods are higher than those of most European countries, he will advise the Egyptian Government to improve the condition of the rolling stock and at the same time to reduce passenger fares and goods rates.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): I cannot undertake to interfere with the administration of the Egyptian State railways.

### Egyptian Government Service—Native Candidates.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, seeing that Englishmen seeking to qualify by examination for posts and promotion in the Egyptian Government service are allowed to answer the questions set them in their own language, he will advise the Egyptian Government to accord native Egyptians who present themselves at examinations for primary and secondary certificates, for diplomas granted by the higher or technical schools and professional colleges, and for posts and promotion in the Egyptian Government service, the option of answering questions in their own language.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The particular changes advocated in this Question are part of the general question of the encouragement of teaching in Arabic. This was dealt with recently in a speech of the Minister of Instruction, which has been presented to Parliament, and from which will be seen the extent to which the question occupies his attention. Any changes which are made must be upon the initiative of the Egyptian Government, and pending any further pronouncement by them I can give no more information.

### Egyptian Railway Advertisements.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that large sums of money are annually paid by the Egyptian State Railways Administration for inserting in Egyptian newspapers whole pages of their time-table, although the official time-table of such administration is published at regular intervals; and whether, seeing that such advertisements are greatly in excess of public requirements and are inserted in such newspapers with the object of influencing their proprietors and editors in favour of the Government policy, he will advise the Egyptian Government to discontinue the practice.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not aware of any of the facts stated or alleged in the Question, and in any case I cannot undertake to interfere with the methods of making railway time-tables known in Egypt.

### Hague Conference.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for

Foreign Affairs whether he can now make any statement in regard to the programme to be discussed at the Hague Conference; and whether he can state the date on which the Conference will meet.

SIR EDWARD GREY: In the invitation which the Russian Government issued to the Powers in April of last year, certain topics were indicated which might be discussed at this Conference. These heads were published in the leading organs of the Press at the time. In accepting this programme as a basis for discussion, His Majesty's Government reserved to themselves the right of raising other cognate questions of international interest not specifically mentioned in the list of the Russian invitation; and the Government of the United States expressed similar intentions. As at present advised, the Conference will assemble at The Hague on the 15th proximo.

### Bahr-el-Ghazal.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will state on what date the Congo troops evacuated Bahr-el-Ghazal.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not in possession of any information later than that contained in the Answer which I returned to the hon. Member for Mid. Armagh on 25th April last.† But I will make inquiries as to whether the instructions then referred to have yet been carried out.

### Lado Enclave.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the proposed transfer of the territories of the Congo Free State to the Belgian Government will affect the lease of the Lado enclave; whether such lease can be transferred without the consent of the British Government; and, if so, whether such consent will be withheld until the whole matter can be thoroughly inquired into.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The conditions under which any transfer of the Congo State may take place are not yet known. Till they are known I cannot say what the effect may be upon the lease in question. In any case, the Answer to the last paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, supposing it is held that any change at all as regards the lease is admissible, is in the affirmative.

### Cost of Customs Collection.

MR. MOND (Chester): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state what would be the approximate increase in the cost of collecting the Customs on the basis of a preferential duty of 2s. per quarter on wheat, 5 per cent. on other foodstuffs, and 10 per cent. on manufactured goods.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.): No, Sir. I have no material for forming a reliable estimate, particularly as regards the last category, which, in the absence of a definition of what may be held to constitute a state of "manufacture," is somewhat indeterminate.

### Unclaimed Dividends.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the number of unclaimed dividends notified in the balance sheets of public companies in this country; and whether, in view of the fact that the owners of these dividends are well known to the secretaries of the companies, he will take steps to have them paid to the owners or else handed to the Exchequer.

MR. ASQUITH: The Exchequer has no claim to unclaimed dividends as such, and I therefore see no reason for taking any steps in the matter.

### Taxes on Food and Drink.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the total of the taxes on food and drink, both Excise and Customs, for the last financial year.

MR. ASQUITH: The total revenue from such taxes, including local taxation revenue, in the financial year 1906–7 amounted to £49,185,599, of which £36,260,893 was contributed by alcoholic drinks.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 264.

### The Edalji Case.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Government will reconsider its decision not to compensate Mr. Edalji, having regard to the fact that the verdict of the jury was unsatisfactory and that, by reason of this verdict, he has undergone imprisonment and suffered professional ruin.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): No, Sir. I have most carefully considered all the facts of the case, but I have found it impossible to come to any other conclusion than that which has already been made public.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked whether there was any precedent for compensation not being granted to a prisoner wrongfully imprisoned and who had received a so-called free pardon.

MR. GLADSTONE: I know of no analogous case.

MR. PIKE PEASE asked whether by a free pardon was meant, in the opinion of the Home Office, that Mr. Edalji did not commit the crime with which he was charged, and for which he had suffered imprisonment.

[No Answer was returned.]

### Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

MR. GLOVER (St. Helens): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when he proposes to bring in the Bill to shorten the hours of labour in mines.

MR. GLADSTONE: I cannot say exactly on what date this Bill will be ready for introduction as the subject is complex and difficult, but I am proceeding at once with the work of preparing it.

MR. GLOVER: Will it be brought in this session and passed into law?

MR. GLADSTONE: I certainly hope to bring it in this session.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): Is the Bill likely to follow the lines suggested by the Departmental Committee?

MR. GLADSTONE: I think the hon. Gentleman had better wait the introduction of the Bill.

### Infants in Public Houses.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it will be possible for him to make arrangements to have certain public houses privately watched on appointed dates with a view to ascertaining how many persons carrying children in arms and how many children apparently under the age of sixteen enter them; and, if so, whether he will cause such observation to be kept.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have, with the assistance of the police, been making special inquiry into this matter in several of the largest towns in the country, but the information I wish to gather is not yet quite complete.

### Hull Docks Dredgings.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the North Eastern Railway dredgers are, by direction of the Board of Trade, depositing the mud dredged up from the docks at Hull opposite the village of Paull, to the detriment of the fishermen of that village; and whether he will give instructions to the North Eastern Railway to deposit this mud elsewhere.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The Board of Trade, with the concurrence of the Humber Conservancy Commissioners, have sanctioned the deposit of the dredgings from in front of the new Albert Dock Quay at Hull, at a spot off Skitterness, on condition that the deposit is made only on the ebb tide, and that it shall be discontinued forthwith should the Board at any time call upon the North Eastern Railway Company to do so. Up to the present no complaint has been received by the Board of Trade from the fishermen at Paull, and I am not prepared, with my present information, to give any instructions in the matter.

MR. STANLEY WILSON asked whether if he brought evidence to the notice of the President of the Board of Trade that damage was being done to the fishermen he would give instructions to the North-Eastern Railway to deposit the mud elsewhere.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am prepared carefully to consider any representations made by the hon. Gentleman on behalf of the fishermen.

### Expenditure on the Unemployed.

MR. HADDOCK (Lancashire, North Lonsdale): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what was the total sum expended during the last financial year out of the £200,000 allotted for relief of the unemployed.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I may refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by the Prime Minister to a similar Question on the 15th instant. He then stated that the total sum expended out of the grant was £124,022.

### Cost of Education in Glamorganshire.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he is aware that the ratepayers (Church and Nonconformist) of Dinas Powis, in Glamorganshire, have in the past four years contributed some £3,500 towards the cost of education in the county; that the local education authority have during that period allowed nothing out of the rates for the maintenance of the Dinas Powis School; that the nearest provided school is at Cogan, some two and a-half miles distant; and that about 100 children attending the Dinas Powis School are the children of Nonconformist parents; and whether, in the circumstances, he will represent to the local education authority the desirability of their contributing towards the maintenance of the Dinas Powis School, out of the education rates paid by the Dinas Powis ratepayers, a sum sufficient to maintain the school in a state of efficiency not lower than that of the provided schools throughout the county.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): As I informed my hon. friend on the 25th April, so long as the local education authority perform their statutory duty of maintaining and keeping efficient the public elementary schools in their area, the expenditure incurred by the authority on individual schools is not subject to review by the Board of Education and does not require their sanction. The accommodation at the Dinas Powis School is scarcely adequate and there are certain defects in the furniture which are now the subject of correspondence with the education authority. With these exceptions I have no reason to suppose that the condition of the Dinas Powis School is other than satisfactory.

### Compulsory School Absence and the Education Grant.

MR. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that when individual children are kept away from an elementary school by order of the medical officer of health their absence, by reducing the average attendance, reduces the Parliamentary grant; whether he is aware that reduction under such circumstances operates hardly upon poor districts, and discourages proper precautions against the spreading of disease; and whether steps can be taken to assimilate the administration of elementary schools in this particular to that prevailing in secondary schools, where no loss of Parliamentary grant is sustained through absence caused by illness.

MR. LOUGH: The absence of individual children, whatever be the cause, necessarily reduces the average attendance of the school, but I do not think any serious loss of grant results from exclusion under medical authority; for example, the exclusion of forty children for a week would only involve a loss of about £2 to the local education authority. The method of computing average attendance will, of course, be one of the questions demanding careful consideration in connection with any scheme for reorganising the system of grants, but I have grave doubts whether the system at present in force in secondary schools could be applied without very considerable modifications to elementary schools.

### Keiss School Board.

Mr. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been called to the action of the School Board of Keiss, Caithness-shire, in discharging a teacher on account of his religious views; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire); No representations have been made to me on the subject, and it is therefore premature to say what action I may take.

### Embo Pier, Sutherland.

Mr. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether any arrangements have yet been made to lengthen and improve the pier at Embo, Sutherland, so that the fishermen may carry on their business with safety; and, if not, will he take steps to have the works carried out which are necessary and have been long asked for.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Congested Districts Board do not feel that the increase of the fishing industry that was anticipated when it was first decided to make a pier at Embo has resulted from that work. The Board, therefore, hold that they are not justified by experience in spending further public money on this pier.

### Durness-Thurso Steamboat Service.

Mr. MORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has yet arranged for a regular steamboat service from Durness to Thurso, calling at intermediate ports; and, if not, will he endeavour to arrange for such a service, so that the people may have an opportunity of getting the produce to a market.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Congested Districts Board are sensible of the utility of sea communication along the North Coast, but they can only aid where they have a reasonable assurance that after a limited period of trial, sea transit would develop a sufficient fishing traffic to pay. The inquiries that have been made as to this result being arrived at have not been encouraging, but any local representation on the subject will receive careful consideration.

### Boyle Untenanted Lands.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland the amount of rent receivable by the Estates Commissioners from the three members of the Boyle Board of Guardians to whom they recently let seventy acres of untenanted land near Boyle, and terms of the tenancy.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners have made a temporary letting of this land for six months from the 1st instant, the rent being at the rate of £64 3s. 10d. per annum payable in advance.

### Irish Swine—Inspection of Carcases.

Mr. WATT: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ensure that all carcases of swine slaughtered in Ireland for export are inspected in accordance with the recommendation of the Local Government Board, namely, that the presence of tubercular deposit in any degree should involve seizure of the whole carcase and organs; and, if the carcases and organs cannot be inspected by competent inspectors in Ireland, will he take steps to prevent the flesh being exported to Scotland for human food.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board for Ireland have on two occasions brought the recommendation mentioned in the Question to the notice of local authorities in Ireland, but the Board have no power to enforce its adoption. The inspection of meat intended for human food is a matter for the local authorities themselves. The Board have no power to prohibit the export of meat. I have no information that unfit meat is exported to Scotland, but if it be suggested that such is the case I imagine that the Scottish local authorities would have power to deal with the matter. Upon that point, however, my hon. friend should address the Secretary for Scotland.

## NEW MEMBER SWORN.

The right hon. Henry Chaplin, for the county of Surrey (North-Eastern or Wimbledon Division).

### SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Public Health Bill):—Mr. Secretary Gladstone; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Public Health Bill): Mr. Burns.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee A the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Public Health Bill):—Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. W. Wilson, Mr. Staveley-Hill, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Corrie Grant, Mr. Hall, Mr. Helme, Mr. Jowett, Mr. Layland-Barratt, Mr. Samuel Roberts, Mr. Robinson, Captain Baring, Mr. Charles Nicholson, Mr. Manfield, and Dr. Macnamara.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill):—Mr. Burns and Dr. Macnamara; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill): Mr. Secretary Gladstone and Mr. Herbert Samuel.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee B the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill):—Mr. Du Cros, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Chaplin, Mr. Steadman, Mr. Bennett, Sir Edward Tennant, Mr. Arnold Herbert, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Wiles, Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Marnham, Mr. Duncan Schwann, Viscount Turnour, and Mr. Lynch.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Vaccination Bill):—Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Kearley; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Vaccination Bill): Mr. Burns and Dr. Macnamara.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee C the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Vaccination Bill):—Mr. Lupton, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Enoch Edwards, Mr. Wedgwood, Captain Kincaid-Smith, Mr. Sears, Mr. Horniman, Sir William Collins, Sir John Tuke, Mr. Cave, Mr. Burdett-Coutts, Mr. Houston, Mr. Walrond, Mr. Ffrench, and Mr. Flavin.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A: Mr. Shackleton; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Macpherson.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C: Mr. George Roberts; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Shackleton.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added the following Member to Standing Committee B: Mr. Henniker Heaton.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A: Mr. James Mason; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Rothschild.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Bright; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill): Mr. Charles Roberts.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

## *NEW BILL.*

### PURITY OF MILK SUPPLIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To ensure the purity of Milk Supplies of the rural and urban districts of Scotland," presented by Mr. Watt; supported by Sir Andrew Torrance, Mr. Charles Price, Mr. M'Callum, and Mr. Halley

Stewart; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 213.]

---

## TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT, (Oldham) in the Chair.]

Clause 1:—

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) moved an Amendment providing that, for the purposes of the reorganisation under the Act, the description of "the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers" should be substituted for "His Majesty's military forces other than the Regulars," the phraseology used in the opening sentence of the clause. He had anticipated that some other Member of the House would have given notice of the Amendment, which, he said, was one of substance as far as the Volunteers were concerned and of nomenclature as far as the Yeomanry and Militia were concerned. The continuance of the Irish Militia was an argument for keeping the name of the Militia in the Bill. The Secretary of State in that House and Lord Portsmouth in another place had declared, as he understood it, that they would consider if it were possible to retain certain battalions of Militia in England and Scotland on their accepting certain conditions not yet laid down; but whether that was so or not the continuance of the Irish Militia made a case for keeping the word "Militia" in the Bill. As far as the Yeomanry were concerned, the right hon. Gentleman had explained that for a time they might continue as they were, and that, for three years at any rate, where county associations had not come into force, they might continue to enrol men under the Yeomanry system. So far, therefore, as those two branches were concerned it was merely a question of nomenclature. But as regarded the Volunteers the matter was one of substance, for, both as to their history and as to their popularity, the term had a definite signification. He was one of those who desired the Secretary of State to reduce the number and simplify the nature of the various forces we now had, but at the same time he was a strong supporter, and the Volunteers throughout the country as a whole were strong supporters, of the retention of the civilian element in the force. They preferred to continue to use the old word "enrolment" instead of "enlistment" because it was popular and calculated to attract the civilian element, while "enlistment" was unpopular and likely to repel. Taken in connection with the friction which had always naturally existed between the military and the civilian element owing to the inability of the War Office to understand the latter, the retention of the word "Volunteer" became of increased importance. It was not necessary to go into the history of the name. Every one remembered that the term "Volunteers" was deliberately adopted in the time of Mr. Pitt, and in the American Colonies as well as here it was the more popular name for the civilian forces. The American Volunteers fought for us far better than the American Militia of the wars of the 18th century, and the term "Volunteers" was enthusiastically adopted here in 1859 on the revival of the Volunteer movement in this country. The Australian Colonies, and New Zealand too, had retained the name Volunteers for their recently created forces of that description, while in America the term "Volunteer" or "National Guard" had been preferred. There might be taken some objection to the form of his Amendment because it spoke of the "Yeomanry" and not the "Imperial Yeomanry," but he had purposely dropped out the word "Imperial" because he never liked it or understood it in connection with that force, which was enlisted for home service, and was not Imperial in its nature. The scheme of Mr. Seddon which had become the law in New Zealand was one for the creation of an Imperial Yeomanry throughout the Empire for service across the seas, but it had never been taken up in this country, and no such Yeomanry existed. The important part of the amendment, however, was that which touched the name "Volunteers," because that implied a desire to retain or to give as far as possible civilian management of the Volunteers, and to see them represented at the War Office by a man who understood them and commanded their confidence. The Secretary of

State for War would perhaps remember a very interesting occasion recently when he took the chair at a lecture on the Swiss Army, and he would not forget the importance which was attached there to the keeping separate the civilian and military ideals. Hitherto the regular soldiers at the head of our Army had shown inability to understand the Volunteers, and he held that it was most desirable that the Volunteers should be represented at the War Office by some one who could understand them, and whom they could trust. At the present moment the principal officers on the Army Council—very distinguished as they no doubt were—had not shown their ability to understand the Volunteers and their peculiarities, and it was therefore most desirable that the Volunteers should be managed there by a man having his own Department and having the same powers as his colleagues. On these grounds he asked the Committee to accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the words 'His Majesty's military forces other than the Regulars,' and insert the words 'the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers.'"—(*Sir Charles Dilke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington) said that he was rather at a loss to know whether this was the first of a long series of Amendments intended to transform the Bill, or an Amendment standing by itself. In the latter case, it would effect nothing at all. The purpose of the clause was simply to institute associations in the counties to reorganise "the military forces other than Regulars." That term had been used deliberately, because the functions of the associations would extend to many useful things besides those connected with the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, such as dealing with Reservists and discharged soldiers; and the Amendment, therefore, only narrowed the functions of the associations, and without purpose. He did not remember that this question was raised on the Second Reading debate.

*Sir Charles Dilke.*

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I had an Amendment on the Paper to create a member of the Army Council to represent the new force.

MR. HALDANE: That is another matter.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: It is closely connected with it.

MR. HALDANE said he had expressed his sympathy with the idea that the new force should have civilian representation at the War Office. In the end that would be the proper function of the civil member of the Army Council; but, to begin with, he proposed to take the organisation into his own hands. He had latterly been much in contact with the Auxiliary Forces, and he was more or less familiar with the machinery proposed in these changes, and therefore the work was such as he would not find it difficult to undertake. The suggestion that it was important to retain the name "Volunteers" was a new one. He had found that there was nothing the Volunteers desired so much as to be taken seriously, and, by usage, the name "Volunteers" connoted something that was not very real. Many Volunteer officers had told him that they were willing to undertake all that was asked of them if they were treated as really responsible people. He was not particularly enamoured of the title "Volunteers," and the Bill had hitherto gone on the assumption that "Territorial Army" or "Home Force" was the best description of the new second line. He regarded the Amendment as rather retrograde in effect and felt that, after careful consideration, they had adopted the best phraseology possible.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) did not think it mattered very much whether the new force was called the Territorial Army or retained the old known names, Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteers, but the burden of proof rested on the right hon. Gentleman to show that there was some distinct advantage to be gained by changing the names. The right hon. Gentleman had been endeavouring to make himself acquainted with the Volunteers during the last twelve months, but he (Sir Howard Vincent) had been doing so for the last twenty-three or twenty-four years, and so far as he was aware there was no feeling of anything like repugnance at the term "Volunteer." On the contrary, he believed that the great majority of Volunteers were proud of the name; and there was always great risk in changing names which had become familiar. Parents did not object to their sons going into the Volunteers, because they knew the liabilities involved and were assured that the civil avocation of the Volunteer would not be interfered with; and there would be considerable risk in changing the name because parents would say "Our boy has gone for a soldier: he is enlisted and not enrolled; he has incurred fresh liabilities of which we are entirely unaware." He quite realised and appreciated the desire of the Secretary of State to invest the Volunteers with actual functions, but he did not think anything was to be gained by changing the name to which the country and the force were accustomed. Strongly sympathising as he did with what had fallen from the right hon. Baronet he would support the Amendment if it were pressed to a division.

SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) thought there was great evil in obliterating a name which carried with it so vital a principle as was embodied in the word "Volunteer." His chief objection to the change was that it might be interpreted, by those who were interested in developing that line of thought, as the introduction of conscription on the Continental footing. It would be declared that the corner stone had been laid for the complete militarisation of the citizen soldiery.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham) asked the right hon. Gentleman what he proposed to call the individual member of the Territorial Force. They could not call him a "military person." He was now either a Volunteer, a Militiaman, or a Yeoman. The individual member would want to have some simple name by which he could distinguish himself. The right hon. Baronet had referred to the term generally used in the United States. He did not quite agree with him. As a matter of fact individual members of the National Guard or Volunteers were known as Militiamen, and they became Volunteers only in the case of war, when they were disbanded in their capacity as a Militia force and re-enlisted as United States Volunteers.

MR. HALDANE said he would be very sorry to attempt to define beforehand what the name would be. One always found that the social habits of the people evolved the best name in these circumstances. There would be an ample choice.

MR. ARTHUR LEE asked whether there would be no official name at the War Office by which the individual members would be known? Were they to depend on the social habits of the people to find the name?

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud) said he did not gather that it was intended to do away with the term "Volunteers."

MR. HALDANE: No, so far as I know it may go on, and if the Territorial Force prefers to keep the name "Volunteers" it is possible it will be so named. But I did not want to pledge myself to any name beforehand.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN said he was pleased to hear that, because, speaking as a Volunteer officer, he did not at all agree in the view that names counted for nothing, but thought that sentiment was a thing that even a Secretary of State for War must pay some regard to. He sincerely hoped his right hon. friend would pay attention to what had been said on both sides of the House, and allow them in the future to keep the name they now had. Volunteers were quite prepared to do more work than they had done in the past, but he was sure they would prefer to keep their old name.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said the right hon. Gentleman had placed himself in some difficulty. He had admitted that the Militia were not to be changed and that their organisation was to be incorporated in the new Territorial Army, and he had also stated that the Yeomanry were to be retained. There only remained, therefore, the Volunteers. As soon as the right hon. Gentleman began to appeal for recruits for his new organisation, he must appeal to them as "the Territorials," or, as had been suggested, "the Terriers," or as Militia or Yeomanry or Volunteers, as under the old system. He thought that before the Committee went further they ought to have some sort of suggestion from the right hon. Gentleman as to what the individual member, the Yeoman, the Militiaman, or the Volunteer, was to be called. [AN HON. MEMBER: Haldanes.] Much, as an individual member of the force, he might approve that, he thought it would scarcely suffice under the circumstances. The new force must have a definite name, as well as a definite duty.

COLONEL HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.) thought the difficulty could be disposed of by the very simple device of calling the force collectively the Territorial Army and of giving to each member of its different branches the designation which he had always had—the Volunteer soldier, the Militia soldier, and the Yeoman soldier. There was a precedent for that in a certain distinguished regiment, and he did not see that there could be any difficulty in making the distinction.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said it was evident there was something more behind the Amendment than the mere question of nomenclature. He did not quite understand the objection of the Secretary of State to the Amendment on the ground that it would have a limiting effect on the Bill. If they put in the words "Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers" instead of the negative words of the right hon. Gentleman, it would still be possible to deal with all the subjects with which the Bill was intended to deal, because the right hon. Gentleman had very wisely put in the saving phrase "and for such other purposes as are mentioned in this Act." Did the Government desire to minimise or to diminish, if not to obliterate, the distinction which existed between the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers? If so, he dissented from that policy. Those distinctions corresponded to real differences. They would get a man to be a Yeoman who would not be a Volunteer or a Militiaman, and similarly they would get a man to be a Militiaman or a Volunteer, but nothing else. If the right hon. Gentleman altered the description which he had chosen to put in the first clause he would get rid of a criticism which he had heard some people bestow upon the Bill—namely, that if the necessity arose, by a mere change in a clause the Bill could be turned into a measure for universal compulsory service. He was sure that that was neither the policy nor the wish of the right hon. Gentleman. He was not absolutely sure that it was not the policy of some with whom the right hon. Gentleman was necessarily and rightly in close consultation. He would like to see in the first line of the Bill words which would make it absolutely clear that the Bill applied only to the old recognised forces which he desired to see kept up—namely, the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers. That would, at any rate, prevent misconception and make the policy of the Government perfectly clear, and for that reason he should support the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet.

MR. HALDANE pointed out that the very purpose of the Bill was to get rid of compulsion in the Auxiliary Forces. The right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that the Militia was a force based on compulsion, and it was not raised by compulsion only because every year they passed a clause suspending the Militia Ballot Act. They could not apply the compulsory clauses of the Militia Act to the new force. The right hon. Gentleman had also spoken in favour of retaining the old lines behind the Regulars, but they had decided on the Second Reading, by a majority of three to one, that they would not attempt to organise on the old lines. As for the question of the name, the debate had convinced him that it would be an absolutely foolish thing if the Government tried to stereotype the name in the Bill. [OPPOSITION cries of "Why?"] Surely they did not really think names were created by Act of Parliament? The men of the new forces would be called whatever they wished to be called, and that might be left to work itself out.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that the Bill does not interfere with the Militia Acts?

MR. HALDANE said that those Acts would become obsolete and have no application to this force.

*SIR **CHARLES DILKE**: It has been held by the Law Officers of the Crown and it has been repeatedly stated in another place that the Militia Ballot Act is now obsolete inasmuch as it provides for a Militia force of a kind which no longer exists.

COLONEL **KENYON-SLANEY** (Shropshire, Newport) suggested that if the Militia were exempted from the purposes of this Act then the Ballot Act might become operative. They all sympathised with the right hon. Gentleman in his difficulty with regard to nomenclature. He was creating a new democratic force, and not unnaturally wished to abolish old titles, because it was easier to create a new force under a new title. But personally he would like to see the old names retained, and therefore he would vote for the Amendment.

VISCOUNT **MORPETH** (Birmingham, S.) said there was a good deal more than a matter of phraseology at issue. The Amendment, if passed, would save the Militia, which otherwise would cease to exist, whatever might be said to the contrary. Many people attached great importance to the Militia Ballot Act, because in time of war it was the only standby we had whereby we could provide troops. It was doubtful, indeed, if the right hon. Gentleman would find it possible to get the large number of men he was asking for without some system of ballot. The great point was to save the Militia, and he was perfectly indifferent as to how it was accomplished so long as it was done.

MR. **McCRAE** (Edinburgh, E.) said the House had already decided the lines on which organisation should proceed. His objection to the Amendment was that it would stereotype the divisions which already existed. It would place the Militia definitely in the Territorial Army, and prevent the Secretary of State considering whether they should not subsequently take their place in the first line. In the working out of the scheme he believed it would be found that the Militia would eventually take their place in the first line. In any case, he asked the House to give the right hon. Gentleman a perfectly free hand in that respect and not commit him to the policy of amalgamating them with the Volunteers and Yeomanry.

MAJOR **SEELY** (Liverpool, Abercromby) understood that the right hon. Gentleman accepted the main point in the Amendment and admitted that the Volunteer force was valuable, because men joined it who would hesitate to join what was called the Territorial Army. There was always a suspicion that the term "Army" involved service abroad, and undoubtedly if they abolished the term "Volunteer" they would lose many men from the force. What they did by the Bill was to give unity of command to the Territorial Force, and to differentiate completely the Foreign Army from the Home Army. What the men would be called would be decided by their designation in the Army List. There was nothing to prevent them from being called the 1st Dorsetshire Volunteers, the 2nd Lancashire Volunteers, and so on. The right hon. Gentleman indeed had said that he saw no harm in that. There was no harm to be done by retaining the word "Volunteer" so long as they made it quite plain that they intended to stick to the principle of organising the Army on two lines. He would be disposed to support the Amendment of his right hon. friend, because he agreed with him with regard to the use of the word "Imperial" before Yeomanry. [Ironical OPPOSITION cheers.] He trusted hon. Members opposite would not suppose that he objected to the word "Imperial" in every aspect or in its general aspect. He understood that the general feeling of the Yeomanry officers was that they did not like "Imperial" added to the word "Yeomanry" as it was a meaningless title. [OPPOSITION cheers of "Why meaningless?"] Because it did not mean what it said. The word "Imperial" was invented during the time of the war with the intention that the Yeomanry should be formed not only in this country, but in the Colonies, and that they should be liable to be called upon to serve in all parts of the world. That had been refused by the Colonies themselves, and so the title should be dropped as not hallowed by usage and inapplicable. He thought that as the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean had practically got all he asked for, he would not vote for the Amendment.

**Mr. J. WARD** (Stoke-on-Trent) said that to his mind the Amendment involved one of the main principles and objects of the Bill as a whole. He did not see any necessity for the Bill unless it was to unify the triple organisation of our old auxiliary defence force—Yeomanry, Militia, and Volunteers; if they were going to retain those three titles it seemed to him that the object they had in view would be frustrated. The noble Lord the Member for South Birmingham had supported the Amendment for a reason which should make Labour Members oppose it. He had stated that by the Bill they were indirectly destroying the compulsory power of the Militia Ballot Act. He (Mr. Ward) was against compulsion in every direction in regard to military service. He felt certain that it was not necessary so far as home defence was concerned; and knowing that in some sections of the community there was a tendency to advocate compulsion, the mere suggestion of the noble Lord that by giving the home forces a new title they would forward that movement, was one of the best reasons why every democrat and every Labour Member should oppose it.

***Sir CHARLES DILKE** said he wished to repeat that the Militia Ballot Act was not applicable to the present Militia force. That Act was obsolete. On the point really at issue he was not altogether satisfied; but as he had got a half of what he wanted he would not challenge a division.

**Mr. STANLEY WILSON** (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) said he could not agree with the hon. and gallant Member for the Abercromby Division that the word "Imperial" before "Yeomanry" was useless. The title was given to them at the time of the South African War, and it was allowed to be retained when they came home as a name of honour for what they had done during that campaign. As to the wish of the Government to do away with the old names of the Auxiliary Forces, he and his friends wanted a definite reply from the right hon. Gentleman. As a Yeomanry officer he strongly protested against getting rid of that title; it was an old title of which they were proud. He earnestly trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his determination and accept the Amendment of the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean.

**Sir GILBERT PARKER** said he wished to draw attention to the very significant statement made by the hon. Member for East Edinburgh, viz., that the Bill would ultimately make the Militia practically obsolete; that they would be a portion not of the second, but of the first line. He supposed that the Special Contingent Reserve Battalions would absorb all those recruits who previously went into the Militia. Now that they understood that the Militia was to be practically removed from the Army system of the country, he thought that all hon. Members would regret it. The statement of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh was the most significant statement made in the House since the Bill was brought in. He thought they ought to press the right hon. Gentleman to say whether the Militia were to be obliterated altogether.

**The CHAIRMAN** suggested that it would be very much better to take the debate on the Militia on the next Amendment which specifically dealt with that force.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 212; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 182.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somer't)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Burns, Rt. Hon. John

Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst’d
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, James
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Furness, Sir Christopher
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr A. E.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope,W.Bateman (Somerset,N
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
JonesWilliam (Carnarvonshire)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald,J. M. (Falkirk B’ghs
Maclean, Donald
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N.(Donc’st’r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb’gh,Central)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, R. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Br’df’rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson,Sir William Snowdon
Rowlands, J.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Tomkinson, James
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Tent)
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt’n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M‘Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.SirAlex.F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Jowett, F. W.
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Mackarness, Frederick C.
Macpherson, T. J.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Parker, James (Halifax)
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mp'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Sheffield,Sir Berkeley GeorgeD.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson,W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Gilbert Parker and Mr. Stanley Wilson.

*MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) moved an Amendment exempting the Militia from the operation of the Bill. He said that this and consequential Amendments obviously raised a matter of the most important kind in regard to the most far-reaching military changes which had been brought forward in this country for many years. Those who had given him the information enabling him to bring forward the matter were very anxious that he should make it quite clear to the Secretary of State for War that, although they thought he was mistaken, they were not unmindful of his courtesy and consideration in regard to the changes which he had proposed. The first point which had struck those who were interested in the military forces of the Empire was the very serious step which the right hon. Gentleman was taking in regard to the Militia. In fact, in dealing with the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the Volunteers, the right hon. Gentleman had completely ignored the historical bases upon which those forces had depended in the past, and grown up to their present condition. Each service was possessed of some special attraction to those who were willing to serve in it. The Militia went so far back as the old Train Bands in the time of Charles the First, and continued until the time when service was made compulsory in the reign of George III. Following the system inaugurated in 1852 with the Compulsory Ballot Act, one found that the Militia had had its origin and had developed on lines peculiarly its own down to 1865 when the Militia Ballot Act was introduced, which had been maintained ever since by the Expiring Laws Continuance Act. From that time forward also one found that there were a number of circumstances connected with the Militia which were not to be found in the case of the Volunteers or of the Yeomanry. As the Duke of Bedford had pointed out in another place, since Pitt reorganised the Militia there had never been a time when the country had made a demand on them and the force had not responded to the wants of the country. From 1803 to 1813 a very large proportion of the total number of those who served in the wars came from the Militia, so that the right hon. Gentleman would see that whatever excuse might be derived from the Militia being always "bled white," applied with as much force at the beginning of the last century as now. Coming to 1853, the next comparable crisis in the history of the nation, the force was revived, and it had to do garrison duty not only in the United Kingdom, but also in the Mediterranean, Egypt, and other places. During the Indian Mutiny both for purposes of drafts and for garrison duty the Militia rendered valuable service. During the war in South Africa the only military force which provided full units for itself was the Militia, in spite of the fact that the force was said to be "bled white."

That continued during the whole course of the war, and they sent complete units to the extent of sixty-one battalions of Infantry absolutely serving in South Africa, and nine battalions serving in the Mediterranean and in Egypt, seventy in all. That meant that 100,000 men served in South Africa, Egypt, and the dependencies of the Empire, and the Regular Force absorbed 50,000 men by transfer from the Militia. He did not propose to enter upon the question of the behaviour of the Militia, because the Committee would recall that their conduct had been praised by General Knox, who said that he could not recollect an instance in which they had failed him; Lord Kitchener had said that their conduct was highly creditable, and they had also been praised by General French for their brilliant defence of Fraserburg. It was sufficient as a summary to say that 226 Militia officers were mentioned in despatches, and 245 non-commissioned officers and men wore the King's medal for distinguished service. In 1902, 8,000 men passed from the Militia into the Army, and the average was now 12,000 a year. What evidence had the right hon. Gentleman leading him to the conclusion that he would obtain in the future the 12,000 troops he formerly obtained from the Militia? He might point out that many men passed into the Regular Army through the avenue of the Militia whom the Regular Army would not otherwise obtain, simply because they were enabled in a tentative fashion to discover through their Militia service whether or not a military career would have attractions for them. Out of 100 men who underwent six months training under the *Spectator* scheme, and who became competent soldiers during that period, only one intended to go into the Army at the time the training commenced, but twenty-six joined as a result of the training received. The point had been emphasised over and over again that a very large number of the recruits obtained each year for the Army would never join but for the *locus pœnitentiæ* they received in the Militia. The Commission which inquired into the experience of the South African War put it on record that there was imperative need for organised expansion outside the Regular Army, and yet the right hon. Gentleman was destroying the only force which in the history of the country for 150 years had never failed to provide a reliable source of expansion. They were entitled, therefore, to ask the right hon. Gentleman what was to take the place of the paid Militia Force which had served under the Army Act for 150 years for the necessary expansion and which was now to be destroyed. What was to take its place? It was not easy to say what was meant by the Under-Secretary in another place or even the reports of the right hon. Gentleman. In the first place one was supposed to look as a substitute to a civilian force on entirely voluntary lines, paid for the week or fortnight when the camp was held. There was to be no preliminary recruit training, and company and musketry drill was to be out of the men's spare time. No experienced Militia officer would say that in the Territorial Force, in which was to be incorporated that part of the Militia that was to be for ever destroyed, they would ever discover an efficient substitute for the work which the Militia had done in the past. There was the supply of drafts and the supply of units in time of war. Let them compare the very inadequate training of the Territorial Force with their four weeks annual drill, with food, bounty pay, clothes, and winter months non-training bounty, 1s. a day for a week or a fortnight. It was not surprising that when the Duke of Bedford, as he had stated in another place, communicated with the commanding officers of Militia and asked whether they thought the units under their command could accept the conditions of service offered by the Secretary of State, 104 returned a blunt negative. Only three said yes and fourteen answered not at all. It should make the Committee pause when an overwhelming majority of those who in the past had been responsible for the organisation of the Militia were almost unanimously of opinion that it would not be possible for the force in future to respond to the expectations which the right hon. Gentleman had based upon it. It was vaguely anticipated that part of the Militia would go into the Regular Forces and become an element in the nucleus battalions to which the right hon. Gentleman looked to perform many of the duties now discharged by the Militia. If reliance was seriously placed on the nucleus battalions to render services comparable with those of the Militia, he would point out that they would be composed as to one-third of recruits too young for service abroad, and that they would be drilled with other comrades than those with whom they were to serve and under other officers, a condition which all with any experience of drill of this kind knew to be open to very serious objection. He invited the right hon. Gentleman to state what the proposal of the Government was for providing the organised force which experience had shown to be necessary for home and colonial garrisons on the out-break of war, for the drafts to meet casualties, and for keeping open the lines of communication. Where was he to find the force? Where were the drafts to come from to meet casualties? In that regard they might refer briefly to the experience of the war in Manchuria, which, if nothing else, showed that what they had to face in the future with regard to the responsibility for drafts and the repair of wastage was the destruction of whole battalions. If the nucleus battalions or the special contingents were to be used for that purpose, it was obvious that their usefulness for services such as had been rendered by the Militia in the past was almost entirely destroyed. The right hon. Gentleman knew what were the numbers that would be required on the outbreak of a great war to protect the lines of communication when all the Regulars were required to serve at the front. If the special reserves were going to develop in the direction of provisional battalions for that purpose their drafting functions were gone, and it was extremely difficult to discover where the right hon. Gentleman was to find regiments to guard the lines of communication. He submitted that it would be madness to put the Militia with the Yeomanry and the Volunteers in the melting pot until there was some force adequate to take its place. It had been pointed out that there was a deficiency of 37,500 in the Militia, but that was a reason not for destroying the force, but for improving it and restoring its efficiency. The Secretary of State for War must be aware that, in the judgment of the vast majority of the Militia, if they had control of their own recruiting and received some of the concessions which they had asked for, the Militia would be perfectly competent to continue the service it had rendered in the past. The right hon. Gentleman was himself but a recent convert to the necessity of abolishing the historical force, for a year ago in speaking of the general reforms he wished to make in the Army he declared his intention of protecting the Militia as far as possible from the liability to be exhausted by drafts. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman could not have made such a statement without carefully considering whether or not the Militia was entitled to survive after that reorganisation. The right hon. Gentleman had at that time indicated in great detail that the salvation of the country was to be found in the development of an expeditionary force which was to consist of 154,000 men, of whom 30,000 were to be on a Militia basis. At that time the right hon. Gentleman was of opinion that it was wrong that the Militia should be exhausted by drafts, and indicated his intention, as far as he could, to protect the Militia from the liability to that species of exhaustion. He showed at the time that, equally with themselves, he was desirous of preserving the Militia. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "We have a large number of Militia Garrison Artillery, about 14,000. The Committee may ask: are you sure these Militiamen will do their work, and my answer is yes, the General Staff are perfectly sure."

The right hon. Gentleman's observations showed most clearly that at that time, only a year ago, he and those who were informing him were strongly of opinion that the best hope for the forces of the Crown in the future was to preserve the Militia. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "The Militia must have a new function assigned to them in the organisation of the Army as a whole. They must either fall back into Volunteer work, in which case they would not be paid any more than the Volunteers are paid, or else they must take upon themselves the same obligation as the Regular soldier, and that is to be ready to serve abroad in time of war. In time of war they can be of no use to us unless they form an efficienct first line of support to the Regular Army in the field . . . It is therefore clear that we must ask the Militia to form a first line of draft for the Regular Army in the field and therefore to accept the obligation of going abroad in time of war . . . The Militia have to elect between going into the condition of Volunteers and coming nearer to the Regular Forces. What we are anxious to do is to take the Militia battalions and make them battalions of the Regular Army . . . We propose to put

behind every Regular battalion of the home Army a third or Militia battalion."

Those who were most qualified to speak for the Militia to-day would not have shrunk from the modifications which the right hon. Gentleman was willing to make at that time, nor from the burdens which he thought it necessary to impose upon them. If they had been asked to discharge those duties the Secretary of State would have obtained from them the services which he required. Only twelve months had passed, and the right hon. Gentleman had changed his opinion. He was satisfied that the opinion of the vast majority of those who had served in the Militia was that the first plan of the right hon. Gentleman was far more in the interests of the armed forces of the Crown than his present proposals. He begged to move his Amendment, believing that the right hon. Gentleman ought to consider the matter very carefully before casting away a force which for hundreds of years had never failed to do what the country had asked of it in time of need.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'Regulars' to insert the words 'and the Militia.'"—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HALDANE said the hon. Gentleman had presented the case very temperately, but in a way which he thought would not have been possible for him if he had sat longer in Parliament, for he would have been in his seat through the period when right hon. Gentlemen opposite were responsible for the affairs of the Army, and when they had to deal with this question in a fashion which must have made them, and obviously did make them, realise the difficulties with which they had to deal. During the ten years they were in office there was only one definite proposal put forward on behalf of the then Government as a means of redressing the evils to which the Regular Forces, particularly the infantry of the Line, were subject. When he succeeded to responsibility in these matters, a prolonged investigation disclosed—and about this there could be no manner of doubt—that there were such gaps in the Regular Forces that they were wholly unfit, as at present organised, to be put into the field, unless steps were improvised which ought never to have to be improvised on the outbreak of war. One chief difficulty was that there was no machinery for providing infantry drafts to make up the wastage of war—absolutely none. When that difficulty presented itself to the late Government in 1904, there was put forward in an official Paper of the 2nd August, 1902, the proposition of the then Government for putting right that state of things. Was it what the hon. and learned Gentleman supported? Absolutely not. It was to abolish altogether fourteen battalions of the Line (he felt himself a poor innocent compared with the strong men of those days), and to convert twenty-six more into what were called short service or general service battalions; that was to say, that instead of trained men who had been for a prolonged period with the colours, they were to remain only two years with the colours, and afterwards to be passed into the Reserve. Then they dealt in another fashion with certain other battalions by reducing their establishment and their strength. As regarded the Militia itself, thirty-three battalions were to be taken away and converted into those short service battalions. That was a very drastic proposition, he thought the only practical proposition, put forward by the late Government for dealing with the provision of drafts to make up for the wastage of war. That proposition did not succeed. He had never been one of those who reflected hardly, or at all, on his predecessors who had these difficulties before them and did not succeed in solving them, because he recognised how immense the difficulties were. It was a task of tremendous difficulty, where they had only a Volunteer service, to provide for these things. The present Government had now to solve the problem, and if their solution appeared to be drastic, the reason was that the difficulty could only be coped with by going to the very root of it. It was true that the Militia were an old and very important constitutional body—far more important formerly than in the present time. There was a period in which the Militia might be said to have constituted the main part of the forces of the Crown in this country. That state of things had changed by degrees. It was changed very much when Mr. Pitt began to draft the Militia into the service of the Line, which had to serve so much abroad in the great Napoleonic wars. To-day, in an island such as ours, where our men had to do their fighting usually at a great distance from home, it was the first and primary duty of the War Minister of the day to see that the Regular Line was put into a sound condition, and that could not be accomplished without supplying the drafts for making good the wastage of war, and without having scientific machinery, well thought out, and to be counted upon as workable for the purpose of furnishing those drafts. It was those considerations which had led them to put forward the present proposals. What was the position of the Militia? Was it a force which could provide those drafts and also fulfil the useful purpose of furnishing units for the lines of communication, garrison service, and service in the field, of which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken? Lord Lansdowne had pointed out in the House of Lords that the Militia was a decadent force, and, to use his phrase, it was—

> "plundered at one end by the Regulars and pillaged at the other by the Volunteers."

The Regulars relied upon the Militia for a large number of recruits. They drew some 12,000 every year from the Militia. That took away a great deal of the strength of that force. On the other hand, the Volunteers had more and more been displacing the old county Militia, so that the Militia had been becoming more and more a professional force. The hon. and learned Gentleman had referred to a letter in *The Times* by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, which, so far, he had not had leisure to read, in which it was pointed out that the men in the third battalions would be recruited as young as seventeen. So they would, but as little as possible, though they would inevitably have to be taken young. They would be taken at seventeen into the Militia now, in order to get the material from which the Regular Army could draw recruits. They took them at seventeen, and they then got them at eighteen for service in the Regular Army. That was the experience of the past, and that was why the Government felt compelled to make provision for it in the new organisation, and they hoped, and had good reason to hope, that the age at which they would get recruits would steadily rise. The position of the Militia at present was this. The first function was to supply recruits for the Army. That ought not to be so, but unfortunately it had grown up, because the Militia had more and more ceased to fulfil its old consitutional purpose and had more and more ceased to be a county force. That was the inevitable result of the Cardwell scheme; it was recognised as its primary function to be an auxiliary of the Regular Forces, and they could not go back upon that without damaging an important source of supply of troops for the Army. In the second place, the position of the Militia was this: Under the pressure of which Lord Lansdowne had spoken their strength had been steadily dwindling; they were now 40,000 below establishment, they were nearly 1,000 short in officers, and the position was growing worse and more serious; it had been going on for years. At the time of the South African War the Militia provided, under a system which had been in operation some years, what was called a Militia Reserve, a reserve of Militia who took engagements to go out as drafts for Regular battalions, they were often the pick of the Militia battalions, and they performed splendid service during the war. But their absence ruined the efficiency of the units and left many of them altogether out of fighting condition. As soon as the war showed signs of coming to an end the Government of the day abolished the Militia Reserve, taking away from the Regular Army the sole source they had for getting drafts to supply the wastage of war. That was done in the *bona fide* expectation that there was an alternative in the three years system which it was supposed would give the drafts and at the same time furnish a Reserve. That turned out to be a delusion. Nobody was in favour of the three years system, and everybody rejoiced that it was abolished except under exceptional conditions. That altered the conditions for the worse, because the Militia Reserve was gone, and the situation now was that there was no service to supply the wastage of war. What was the next thing that happened? The Militia were found to be still going back, and when, a year ago, as the hon. and learned Gentleman had said, he proposed to do what Mr. Cardwell had intended, and to make the third battalions drafts for two Line battalions—it was not a perfect form, but it was machinery for keeping the thing going—the Militia commanders said, "If you draw upon us for drafts you will reduce us to the condition we were in at the time of the South African War, and will make us useless units." And they were right. His military advisers pointed out that 124 or 126 Militia battalions were so under strength that there was no way of making them efficient except by compounding them out of all shape and reforming them into composite battalions, in which no identity would be left. It seemed to him, therefore, that the scheme had broken down because the people concerned were not willing to carry it out; and the obvious course to take was to constitute a reserve battalion with the express function of training men to provide for the wastage of war. Those battalions would be available for other and collateral purposes; they would take in surplus recruits and new recruits, and, giving them a large complement of officers, they could in the event of war throw off a battalion for war purposes, while in time of peace there would be a nucleus as a training school for drafts for the Regular Army. If they took men at the age of seventeen, they would only do what the Militia were now doing—providing for a stream of recruits for regular service. They would pass on at eighteen into the Line, and so he calculated, from experience, they would get a stream of recruits for the Line. It was the only method, for it was obvious they could not keep up 124 ragged battalions, some between 200 and 300 below strength. They were driven to that course by the iron logic of facts and by the attitude of the Militia commanders. It had been said it was a quarrel between the commanders and the War Office; but it was not so. The matter was very carefully considered, and he gave the Militia commanders a full testimonial, so far as he was in a position to do so, that they came to their conclusion against being drafted in the conviction that if the drafts were allowed to take place their condition would become worse and worse, until the Militia would practically become extinct. There was no other way, for they were not justified in expenditure for keeping up the Militia under such conditions. They agreed in that view with the late Government, but where they differed from the late Government was in taking a more conservative and less drastic position than a complete rejection of the Cardwell policy, and making a third battalion a means of training, the Militia proper going into the Territorial Force. The hon. and learned Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool had asked what provision had been made for securing the lines of communication and providing for the garrisons. In the first place, the whole of the Irish Militia would enlist under Part III. and become special reservists; but whereas in the past there were eight third battalions of Irish regiments, they would be united to other twelve regiments, more or less of a Militia character, but they would not be a Militia in the old sense; they would belong to the Line, and the difference between the reservists and the training battalion would be that the primary function would not be for drafting. In other words they would simply be twelve regiments composed of special reservists. Subject to that they would try to preserve their traditions as much as possible. There were twelve regiments for the lines of communication. The expeditionary force would take up only sixty-six battalions of the Line, and there would be six over, available for lines of communication added to the twelve. In time of war he reckoned on the training battalions throwing off a battalion, the men being moved to barracks vacated by the expeditionary force. In that way he had no doubt that they would have an ample supply of battalions for the lines of communication and other work of that kind under the organisation which he had proposed. The Militia officers would have their position in the Reserve of Officers. A Militia captain, if he fulfilled the conditions, would enter the Reserve of Officers, and practically have the same employment as at present, receiving pay and allowance and a retaining fee for his liability to take service abroad upon mobilisation, when he would become an officer of the Regular Army. He hoped in time to create a Reserve of Officers by the scheme upon which he was still working, and meanwhile hoped for the assistance of a suitable number of Militia officers who would be willing to take service in the Reserve of Officers. The Militia would cease to be the old Militia, but they would be enormously more effective; part of them would become Regulars, and another part would go to the county for the functions of the county force which the Militia had fulfilled in the past. There were ample possibilities in the future for such battalions. If they wished to go for service abroad, it was open to them, under Clause 12, to engage to do so. In other words, what the Government had aimed at in their scheme was to open up possibilities of improvement which would depend upon individual willingness. How these things would turn out he could not say, for no one could look into the future; but this he did say, that the scheme of the Government, with its provision for the abolition of the present constitution of the Militia, was essential to getting the Line rank into decent condition. He dwelt upon that point with all seriousness, and with a deep sense of his responsibility in the matter. He felt that the condition of the Line was very serious indeed at the present time. Its deficiencies no one could ignore. Nowadays the wastage of war was very high, and if the Line was to be a workable force provision must be made for making up that wastage; and it was because the Government felt the only means they had for making it up lay through the reform of the Militia that they took the step of placing their plan before the country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) said the plan of the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the Militia was one which he had regarded from the beginning with the gravest misgiving and anxiety. As for the rest of the scheme, whether it worked or did not work it would not necessarily destroy the Volunteer Force. The county associations might succeed or they might fail. Failure would not carry with it any great national disaster, and success would mean undoubtedly an improvement in the organisation of the Volunteers and Yeomanry. But the destruction of the Militia was a step which they could hardly retrace, or, at all events, could only retrace at a great sacrifice and after considerable time. He therefore most earnestly begged the Committee to pause and consider most seriously before they decided upon taking a course which, whether right or wrong—and he thought it was wrong—was one at all events fraught with very serious risks, and it might be irremediable risks in the future. The Minister for War had said that the mover of the Amendment would hardly have made the speech he had made had he been in the last Parliament and responsible in some degree for the military policy of the late Government. He did not agree with that. The right hon. Gentleman had always considered in a non-controversial spirit the military proposals of his predecessors in office, and he did not mean to go back upon the old history of Army policy under the late Government; but he did say that nothing occurred in that period which in his judgment ought to prevent any man from taking the course of preventing the destruction of the ancient Militia force of the country. It was quite true that a plan, which never received the assent of the House, was brought forward by his right hon. friend the Member for Croydon, under which the whole stress of providing for expansion was thrown, not upon the Militia, but upon the new short-service battalions; and if there had been called into existence short-service and long-service battalions together, as that plan proposed, they would, no doubt, have given the country a force for foreign service which the right hon. Gentleman's scheme, even in his own view, could never provide. There was an alternative plan affecting the Militia which was never brought before the House, but with which, as there was a record of it, the right hon. Gentleman must be fully acquainted. That plan, while retaining and continuing the peculiar qualities of the Militia, would have provided an improved form of the service which the force had so long rendered to the country, and he was sorry the right hon. Gentleman had rejected it. But what was the basis of his objection to the plan of the Government? He did not put it wholly or mainly on the ground of sentiment. He thought he was a foolish man who ignored sentiment and tradition in such a matter, and was oblivious to the long historic past of the Militia. Still, he would argue the case entirely from a hard, practical business point of view. How were they to get in the most efficient manner the forces they wanted in time of war? The plan of the right hon. Gentleman, put shortly, was to throw the whole stress of war upon the Regular Army battalions, and to provide machinery by which those Regular battalions would be fed in the time of war and the shortage to which they would be then exposed made up. Everybody admitted that there must be some machinery for making up the wastage to which the Regular battalions would be subject in time of war. But it was not common sense not to recognise the fact that in time of war they required units of different degrees of efficiency, and of different degrees of cost as measured by efficiency. The Regular battalions were the most expensive because they were the most highly trained of units. But was it the proper course to throw the whole work of war on those most expensive and, no doubt, most efficient Regular battalions, when some of that work might be effectively done by the less costly, because not so highly trained, Militia? Under the right hon. Gentleman's plan, he would be driven in time of war to use the costly units of the Regular Army, and, by so much, deplete his fighting line of the best troops he had at his disposal. He thought that must be a bad arrangement. What was the right hon. Gentleman's justification? He said that experience had shown that, if they tried to use their machinery for the double purpose of providing drafts and doing other work on the lines of communication and elsewhere, they would find their depleted regiments were perfectly useless for any purpose to which they might desire to put them. Did experience show that that was the fact? While it was quite true that the Militia battalions which served in the South African War were never, for the reasons he had stated, really the equals of the Regular battalions, they nevertheless did excellent work in maintaining lines of communication and in garrison purposes. Not only had recent experience shown that that was the fact, but the right hon. Gentleman by his own policy had admitted it. What had the right hon. Gentleman just told the Committee? He told them that there were Irish Militia battalions which were to be subjected to the double strain of providing drafts and doing work on the lines of communication, a strain which when applied to English troops destroyed the battalions altogether. If that could be done in Ireland, why on earth could not it be done in England? The policy of the right hon. Gentleman in Ireland supplied the severest condemnation of his policy of destroying the Militia in this country. At any rate, the policy of the right hon. Gentleman in Ireland was much nearer the policy which he would like to see universally adopted in regard to the Militia than the policy of the right hon. Gentleman in Great Britain. The supplementary system was wanted to aid in time of peace the general machinery of equipment, but he did not believe that the special reserve battalions would have the attraction for the recruit which the old Militia battalions had. The latter, as every one knew, and as the right hon. Gentleman had said, were a great means of introducing people to a military life, and if they liked the military life they then went into the Regular Army. He believed the Militia battalion, with its present traditions, system, and officers, would fulfil those objects incomparably better than this new and hybrid creation of the right hon. Gentleman, which was neither Militia, Volunteers, nor Regulars. The special reserve battalion would be a battalion only in name, and a depôt would be quite as appropriate a description for it as a military unit. It was an amorphous creation, and although that did not condemn it, it was a consideration which would influence the mind of the recruit. So much for the time of peace. But it was not in time of peace that those battalions were most important; their function was to begin as soon as war was declared. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to anticipate that then those battalions would throw off other battalions which would do all the garrison duty and defence of lines of communication which the Militia had so efficiently done in the past. The process of building new battalions, as far as he understood it, was a process which must inevitably take time. It might well be done in the course of a long war; but could it be done in the first week, month, or three months of a war? In the first three months of the South African War we sent abroad thirty-five battalions of Militia. Were we going to find thirty-five new budded battalions, the hasty offspring of these reserve battalions, in that period? By admission the right hon. Gentleman was creating machinery which could only slowly and imperfectly do that which was adequately done now by the traditional Militia system of the country. The right hon. Gentleman relied upon these reserve battalions as a machinery for providing drafts, and held that no machinery for that purpose could be obtained otherwise. That was not the view of Mr. Cardwell, of whose scheme the right hon. Gentleman was an advocate. Under the Cardwellian scheme the second home battalion was to do for the foreign battalion exactly what the right hon. Gentleman's reserve battalion was to do for both. He would have thought that the right hon. Gentleman was on much sounder and safer lines if he had retained and improved the Militia, and made them liable for foreign service—as they were quite ready to be made liable. He could have made some arrangement with them, which he still believed could be made, whereby they might assist, at all events, in the work of providing drafts, supplementing them, if they required to be supplemented, by Mr. Cardwell's plan of large depôts. That was a plan which seemed to him to carry out all the right hon. Gentleman desired, while keeping that the loss of which they regretted. They would then be able at the moment war broke out to release from the garrisons the highly-trained men who were now locked up in them, and send them to India or elsewhere. Battalions trained economically on a Militia basis were perfectly adequate for the less difficult operations of war, and as the war went on they would receive the necessary training to enable them to go forward with success and honour. They would have all the machinery necessary to supply the drafts necessitated by the wastage in the field. It was a fundamental fact that in war troops were required of different degrees of excellence, and it was very uneconomical to use troops of the first excellence for work of the second order of difficulty. We had troops that could now be used for work of the second order which were extremely cheap, and he could not believe that it was right to abolish them and put nothing in their place. He hoped, even now, that the right hon. Gentleman would modify his scheme—he did not ask him to destroy or revolutionise it — so that our existing system might be maintained to carry out such parts of the scheme as would conduce to the general efficiency of the forces, whether Regular or Volunteer. He regarded this as the most crucial part of the Bill, and earnestly hoped the Committee would most carefully consider their policy before they finally assented to the destruction of an historic force.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover) said he was sure that the Secretary of State for War regretted the absence through ill-health of his predecessor, who had devoted so much time to Army questions. If he might be permitted to say so, he thought that very few men could within the time at his disposal have done so much as the present Secretary of State in investigating the problems connected with Army organisation. The two most important points in the Bill were the special contingent and the Territorial Army. As to the Territorial Army it seemed to him to depend upon whether one believed or did not believe in the possibility of invasion, and if one believed in that possibility he did not think the Territorial Army would be large enough to resist the attack. If, however, one did not believe in the possibility of invasion, that question need not enter into the debate, and therefore the special contingent and the manner in which it was to be formed seemed to be the whole crux of the matter. The special contingent seemed to consist of 75,000 men, but how they were to get that number was quite another matter. The President of the Board of Trade thought that in the present depressed state of the building trade it would not be difficult to get the required number of men, but having in view what the Committee on Physical Deterioration had reported there might be more difficulty than the right hon. Gentleman anticipated. Besides, the same condition of things as now existed in the building trade would not always prevail, and he did not think that it had entered into the minds of the right hon. Gentleman and of hon. Members what wastage would be involved in connection with that force. If that wastage was taken at 15 per cent. it would mean in two years the loss of about 25,000 men, which would reduce the contingent to 50,000, and if there was a war during the next two years there would be no special contingent of the strength which the right hon. Gentleman anticipated to be brought out. Of course we might be lucky enough to avoid war as the right hon. Gentleman hoped, but still they ought to make provision for it in case it should break out. Referring to his own branch of the Service, the Artillery, he quoted the statement of the hon. Member for South Salford that drivers and gunners could not be taught their duties, in six months. He knew the right hon. Gentleman did not agree, and relied on the experience of the Japanese. But in the Japanese war the drivers, as a rule, went along hard roads and only at a walk. He could not think that the right hon. Gentleman contemplated that in the next European war our own drivers would never go off the main roads or move at any greater speed than a walk. He hoped a year's training would be substituted for six months, and urged the desirability of special short-service battalions.

*VISCOUNT MORPETH said that any change in the condition of the Militia was an important consideration to the country, and the abolition of the force would be not only a matter of regret to the members of the force, but a permanent loss to the armed forces of the country. It was true that the right hon. Gentleman at the end of his speech had said that he was not abolishing the Militia but reforming it, but that was a mere figure of speech, because a part of the officers and men were to go to the Volunteers and part to the Regulars, and it was impossible to contend that the Militia was saved when that was the case. The right hon. Gentleman was abolishing a force which could not be replaced and which was more capable of expansion than any other in time of war. It was often said that the Militia was a decadent force, and yet during the South African War it was found possible to send not only drafts from it but units to the front. He did not wish to condemn one branch of the Service at the expense of another, but he would point out that the Militia was the only branch of the Auxiliary Forces which went to the seat of war in units and not merely in individual companies or as volunteers. As he had pointed out, the force had not only sent out units, but drafts of officers and men to the Regular Army. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman would remember that some fifteen or twenty years ago the magazines were full of discussions as to whether the Yeomanry Force had become moribund and ought to be abolished. They all remembered those articles and what a narrow escape the Yeomanry had of being discontinued as one of the Auxiliary Forces. Fortunately it had been saved, as he thought with good results, and if the Militia could be saved and it was properly handled and treated, in twenty years time they would look back to its preservation with equal satisfaction. The right hon. Gentleman, although he told them that he must abolish the Militia Force, had done it in the most urbane and kindliest manner, but his supporters in the Press had not been equally courteous. They accused colonels of Militia regiments of stupidity and even of want of patriotism because they had refused to allow drafts from their regiments. He wondered whether it had ever occurred to those critics that it was moribund because it was called on to produce drafts. There were certain distinguished Army officers who had taken no interest in the Militia except as the producer of drafts, and as soon as the Militia ceased to perform that office it was handed over to the Secretary of State for War and marked down for destruction. The sole interest in the force in the mind of that particular kind of officer was that it should be able to supply drafts to the Regular Army. He knew that the Regular Army was the chief consideration that the Secretary of State for War had before his eyes, and no doubt he was bound to fill up the Regular Army at all costs, but the right hon. Gentleman seemed to think, and this was quite another matter, that the Militia must be abolished because it was unwilling or unable to continue to supply drafts. In a significant part of his speech about recruiting the right hon. Gentleman had pointed out the difficulties of voluntary enlistment, and had said they must go to the root of it, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman had made very little attempt to do so. All he had done was to abolish the Militia, and to put in its place as a draft-producing body the third battalion, but he had not faced the necessity of supplying a large body of men during a great war when an army had to be sent abroad. During the great Napoleonic wars, to which the right hon. Gentleman had made allusion, the Militia was not only enabled to embody as units, but to provide drafts to the Army. Instead of a force which could do that, the right hon. Gentleman proposed a problematical force which was not now and might never be in existence. He doubted whether any of the inducements that led men to enter the Militia or the Auxiliary Forces would carry them into the proposed third battalions. In his opinion the Militia ought to be preserved, because the force would be able to provide the necessary units to free the Regular Army in time of war. As Lord Salisbury had written in a letter to *The Times* recently, there was no excuse for abolishing a force which had been of great use, and had endeared itself to the British people. There were two blots on the Bill which he believed would be largely removed if the Militia were saved. In the estimation of almost every one who had spoken upon the matter, the chief blot was that the troops of the future upon whom we were to rely for home defence would be trained after war had begun, and no one knew whether we should have either the opportunity or the time to give that training when once war had been declared. If the Militia was saved, it would receive its training upon enlistment and from year to year, and though that training might not be adequate the bulk of it would be given before war broke out. On that ground alone it was worth while to save the Militia. The other blot was that there was no force which could be sent out to support the troops at the front, except in the shape of drafts. The right hon. Gentleman had suggested that the Territorial Force should be asked to volunteer in battalions, brigades, or divisions. But no more cruel farce could take place than to ask a battalion to volunteer for active service. There were many men in the Territorial Force who, not from any want of patriotism, but from force of circumstances in their domestic or civil life, were unable to volunteer, and it required a great amount of courage for those men to step out of the ranks when the battalion was paraded and called upon to volunteer for foreign service. It would be far fairer honestly to enlist those battalions which it was proposed to send to the front deliberately from the first to undertake foreign service instead of trying to entrap men into the Territorial Force presumably for the defence of this country alone, and having got them, to parade the battalion and call upon them to volunteer for foreign service. If the right hon. Gentleman would only preserve the Militia instead of abolishing it, he would have a certain number of battalions specially enlisted with an obligation for foreign service. There would be no difficulty then, and the Militia could be easily filled up with that obligation. His experience had been that that would be no bar to filling up the Militia. Everyone was forced to recognise that under the Bill as drafted the Territorial Force was neither more nor less than the Volunteers as they existed at the present time. The Militia was either to be swamped in the Volunteer Force, or drafted in small parcels into the Regular Army. It was very well known that the Volunteer battalions, with all their excellence, partly from want of time and from lack of opportunity to train together, and largely from want of adequate rifle practice, were nothing like such good shooting or such well-trained battalions as the Militia battalions. It would therefore be a very unwise policy to put an end to a force partly, if not highly, trained, and more efficient than the force which, under the right hon. Gentleman's proposal, was going to form the Territorial Army. He had spoken not from any particular love of the Militia force as at present constituted. He recognised that they were not what they should be, and they might be said to be of little value as they stood. But they were the force most easily under the hand of the right hon. Gentleman in any crisis such as the outbreak of a great war. They were the one force outside the Regular Army which was partially trained at any rate; the one force which could be sent abroad without injustice to the force and without that dislocation of the great industries of the country which would necessarily follow if the artisans and others engaged in those industries were to be sent abroad as Volunteers. For these reasons he earnestly pressed on the right hon. Gentleman the urgency of reconsidering the question of the Militia. If he preserved them he would find that, provided they were handled with sympathy and the necessary reforms were introduced, he would have a cheap force behind him in times of emergency.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.) said the mover of the Amendment and nearly everyone who had spoken from the Opposition side of the House had referred to the historical associations of the Militia. But he had noticed that not a single speaker had in any way referred to the present fighting value and efficiency of that force. It seemed to him that those who were responsible for spending the money of the nation on the fighting forces of the Crown were bound to look, not to the historic traditions of the force or its fighting value in the past, but to the value of that force to-day. It was a striking fact that during the last twenty years the strength of the Militia had diminished by something like 20,000 men, whilst during the same period the cost had gone up by half-a-million of money. There was something radically wrong with an organisation which spent an increasing amount on a decreasing number of men and secured decreased efficiency. The Government were, therefore, bound to ask themselves, did the Militia fulfil its duty in our system of national defence? He believed that from the moment a former Secretary of State did away with the Militia Reserve came the death-blow of the Militia. He did not recall a single person who had been responsible to the House for the administration of the Army who thought that the Militia had any other duty than to feed the Army in time of war. We could not at the present time send the Militia abroad. Even under the greatest stress of emergency we could not make use of the organisation of the Militia. Then of what use was the Militia as it stood at the present moment in the emergency of war? There were, he believed, forty-six Militia battalions about 5,000 men under strength: what would be the use of sending such a body to the seat of war? Every Secretary of State who had preceded his right hon. friend had agreed that the Militia was in a most unsatisfactory state. The hon. Member who proposed the Amendment quoted almost vebatim, although he did not give the Committee the source of his inspiration, from a long letter from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon in *The Times* of yesterday. But if he quoted the actual words of the right hon. Gentleman, why did he not complete his argument by a further quotation from the letter? But as the hon. Gentleman omitted to do so he himself might be allowed to fill up the gap. The right hon. Member for Croydon in the lengthy and reasoned letter addressed to *The Times* said—

> "The destruction of the Militia is an immense mistake; not because the Militia as at present constituted is of value as a fighting force. As a matter of fact, it has almost ceased to have any military value at all."

That was a strong admission coming from a right hon. Gentleman who had had the conduct of the War Office of this country for two or three years. And if hon. Members were to quote a description of the Militia as it would be when it became a part of the Territorial Force, he was entitled to point out what, in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, was the real value, at the present moment, of the Militia as a fighting force. It had none in that right hon. Gentleman's judgment. If that were so, the Militia was a superfluity, and we could not at the present time afford to pay for superfluities of any kind. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition had said with perfect truth that various schemes had been put before the House, had been withdrawn, and had never been thoroughly discussed by the House, as to the way in which a reform of the Militia might take place; but it was well for them to recollect that though the right hon. Gentleman was not responsible for those schemes, yet they must have come before the Cabinet of which he was chief member before they could have been presented to the House as the plans of the Government. He did not recollect any single alternative scheme to that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon, which proposed to destroy practically thirty-two battalions of Militia. He did not remember any other alternative scheme to that put forward by the late Government for the reorganisation of a force which they believed to be of no fighting value whatever. His right hon. friend on his side at all events had proposed a clear and definite plan to the House, to enable those men who now enlisted in the Militia force, while ceasing to serve in a force which had no military value whatever, to transfer their services to a part of the defensive forces of the country which, they were sure, had a real, permanent fighting power behind them. That plan practically was to throw the whole burden of a campaign, or a succession of campaigns, upon the Regular

Forces in regular units. It was to be observed in that connection that the colonial establishments of Regular troops were to-day on a very considerably higher standard than formerly. He thought that there were 100 more per battalion than there were before, and to that extent the strength of the Regular Force ready for a campaign in any way touching or directed against the Colonies was far stronger than it had been in previous years. Added to those Regular battalions there would be certain what he might almost call non-combatant units, composed of non-Regulars, for the ammunition columns and the medical and transport services—men who were not required by the necessities of war to have gone through a purely military training. A great deal had been made of the fact that if they abolished the present organisation of the Militia they would do away with the units which, at a later stage of a campaign, they would be obliged to place in the field. In the Russo-Japanese War Japan placed in the field comparatively few units, and fed those units with constant drafts from their forces at home. His right hon. friend proposed to adopt a similar plan, and there was no necessity for the great number of units which hon. Gentlemen opposite had insisted upon. They must have full units facing the enemy abroad, and they must have draft-producing units at home to feed the units abroad. But they did not want a large number of units which were expected eventually to go abroad, which appeared to hon. Gentlemen opposite to be the *rôle* of the Militia at the present time. The Leader of the Opposition had said that there was not much advantage from territorial battalions, and that they only offered a system of depots. But in the case of the third battalions each contained special contingents for special service. Those special contingents could be organised into battalions—it was part of the plan that that should be so—and they would be serviceable as mobile battalions at home or abroad in case of emergency. Great stress was laid by the Leader of the Opposition upon the point that the third battalions would never be able to take the place of the thirty-five battalions taken out of the Militia and sent out to South Africa. The answer to that was complete. At the outbreak of the South African War they were only able to move one or two isolated battalions, in addition to one organised infantry force, which came from Aldershot. That was the whole provision at the outbreak of the war to meet the needs in South Africa. If his right hon. friend's scheme were adopted the moment they mobilised the Army Reserve they would be able to send to the front 160,000 Regular troops, organised in divisions, as organised units, with a complete staff for all arms, and they would not require the services of the thirty-five battalions of Militia which were sent out at the outbreak of the South African War. That was a complete and unanswerable reply to the argument of the Leader of the Opposition. It depended on the success not only of the special contingents, but on the success of ordinary recruiting from year to year. Ordinary recruiting did not fail them at present, and need not be expected to fail them. The plan of his right hon. friend was that, when the whole of the forces were mobilised into a striking force, there would be something like 30,000 men, out of the 160,000 men who would form that striking force, as a special reserve. With regard to what was called the Irish Militia, it had been said, "Why retain the Irish Militia and drop the English Militia?" The answer was very simple. At this moment, there was no Volunteer force in Ireland to represent the territorial force as in England. There, for the moment, the Irish battalions were to remain. There were sixteen battalions, and he thought that gradually they would have to be formed into a force of auxiliary troops, and, as he understood, every attempt would be made to form them into a territorial force. He ventured to say that they could not afford to take superfluities; they could not afford to accept the proposal which was now put before them any more than they could accept the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, who asked the Government to except the Volunteers from their proposals.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: No.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Well, to retain the name of the Volunteers. The hon. Member for the Walton Division asked them to except the Militia; and another hon. Member asked them to except the Yeomanry, and the Government were being asked to break every link in the chain which made their proposals a complete scheme. If those various suggestions were adopted they would be fatal to the whole plan of the Government, and therefore they could not be accepted.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he had listened with great sympathy to the Secretary of State for War, because he believed that the right hon. Gentleman had put his finger on the one vital point by which the whole of his scheme should be judged. The right hon. Gentleman had said that what he had chiefly in view, in regard to the creation of the Territorial Force, was to find adequate reinforcements for the fighting line when engaged outside of this country. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman, and he would suggest to hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House that they should treat that as one of the most essential elements, he had been going to say the most essential element, in considering the question. If the right hon. Gentleman could show how, under his scheme, he could adequately and certainly reinforce the fighting line outside this country, he would be very much inclined to drop his prejudices and fancies, and to support him in dealing with the real crux of the question. What they wanted was a reinforcement by adequately trained drafts to make good the losses. He wished to approach the question without prejudice or bias, and simply from the point of view of one who wished to see the fighting force really efficient. By the abolition of the Militia did the right hon. Gentleman achieve what he desired? Did he substitute for the Militia some other arrangement by which he could get the required reinforcements in a better and more certain way? The Under-Secretary for India had stated that the Government could not afford to pay for any superfluity. In his opinion the whole scheme of the Territorial Army was a silly superfluity unless it was available for reinforcing the fighting line. As far as he could see, it did not provide any such reinforcements. War might be declared, and not until then were they going to ask the proposed force to take any part in supporting the fighting line. There was a great deal of unreality in the scheme, but if the Territorial Army was enlisted in the certain knowledge that it was to reinforce the fighting line, they would have something valuable. If it was only to exist for playing at soldiers at home he did not attach much value to it, and it would be one of those superfluities for which the country had better not be called upon to pay. It was true that the Secretary for War had made the reinforcement of the fighting line somewhat easier by reducing the number of battalions. Could the right hon. Gentleman make good his proposition that by getting rid of the Militia as they existed and might exist, and substituting for them his new Territorial Force, he was providing an adequate power of reinforcement for the fighting line? He did not think he could. The chief objection to the Milita appeared to be the idea that they could not undertake the duty of reinforcement by drafts. If it was true that the Militia authorities declined to reinforce by drafts and only by expansion, he did not think there was any room for the Militia; but he did not gather that that was the case. By enlisting the men on a proper footing he did not think they would have any difficulty in getting a force that would undertake to go abroad in time of war in any capacity which might be thought necessary to meet the emergency. The substitute for the Militia provided by the right hon. Gentleman failed to stand the test of examination. His third battalions would take in a less valuable stamp of men than would come into the Militia if that force were retained and reorganised in the way in which it might be. The wastrel street-corner lad of seventeen years of age was not going to be a very reliable class to reinforce the fighting line. In the first place, they did not keep him sufficiently long to make him efficient. It was the experience of nearly all soldiers that the man who was thoroughly imbued with the regimental *esprit de corps* was three times as valuable as the casual man whom they sent to reinforce an army, who had no particular traditions or what he would call regimental prejudices. The third battalion man would be destitute of any *esprit de corps*, and would possess none of that reliance upon his comrades which went so far to make a soldier efficient in the field. They could not create such feelings as those by the proposed third battalion system. They could not rely upon it that soldiers so supplied would prove any real efficient reinforcement for the men facing the enemy in the field. The Militiamen were to be abolished because they did not supply the necessities of reinforcement, and they were to be replaced by the third battalions which the right hon. Gentleman claimed would supply those necessities. As far as he could forecast the value of the two types of reinforcements, the one supplied from a reorganised Militia and the other supplied from the third battalions, he had no hesitation in saying that it was the reinforcements from the Militia that the fighting soldier would like to have by his side. The point he insisted upon was that in the matter of the Territorial Army the feeling of any branch of the Auxiliary Forces must be absolutely subordinated to the one necessity of making them available to support the fighting line in order to bring victory within their reach. It was because he felt so strongly on this point that he declined to support the scheme put forward by the right hon. Gentleman.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYNDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham) said he agreed with the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that the whole endeavour of the House should be to establish a system by which they could secure adequate reinforcements for the Regular Army in time of national emergency. He thought the scheme propounded by the Secretary of State for War would go a long way towards achieving that object, and that was why he rose to comment upon the series of speeches which had been made in this and the previous debate by Members of the Opposition. Apparently they opposed this branch of the scheme because they imagined that the Militia was to be abolished. That appeared to him to be an entirely misapprehension of the real proposals of his right hon. friend. If it was true that the Militia were to be abolished it would only suffer that result at its own discretion, because there was to be given to every Militia battalion the opportunity of transferring itself to the Territorial Army. The course to be taken would be that the commanding officer, the non-commissioned officers, and the staff would be asked whether or not they desired their battalion as a unit to be transferred to the Territorial Army. He understood that every Militia battalion would have the opportunity of transferring itself as a *cadre* and unit to the Territorial Army, and it would be able to serve under conditions far more favourable to the civilian element than had been the case in the past. Under the present system the Militia had to go under training for a month, but if they were transferred under this scheme they would only be asked to train in the course of the year for a period ranging from seven to fourteen days. One of the chief reasons why the Militia had in recent years become a diminishing quantity was the fact that the stipulation for a month's training very seriously limited the area of recruiting, and they were only able to get recruits from those who were following a precarious and irregular life, it being impossible for men in regular employment to spare the time to go in for a month's training. Under the new system there would consequently be open to the Militia a much larger field for recruiting, because, instead of the Volunteers being a formidable rival, they would now be able to recruit upon an equality. He thought they might reasonably take exception to the statement made by hon. Gentlemen opposite that the scheme embodied a proposal to abolish the Militia, because it would only mean the extinguishing of a unit where the officers in charge themselves came to that decision. The special battalions must, of course, be of a somewhat experimental character, but at the same time it was distinctly understood that they had to supplement the Regular Army. If it was found that the advantages offered to the men were insufficient it might be necessary in the future to increase the offers and opportunities, but at any rate the proposal would be a distinct gain to the Reserve of the Regular Army. The transfer of the Militia to the Territorial Army would enable them in time of national emergency to volunteer in the same way as hitherto, the only difference being that under the new system the Volunteers and the Yeomanry would be placed under the same conditions. In the case of the special battalions, they would only be asked for drafts for the Regular Army. All modern scientific military opinion agreed that it was better to send incompletely-trained drafts to the seat of war than incompletely-trained units. The history of war bore out that contention. In the American War they found that the Federal Army were begging the Government at Washington to send drafts instead of ill-trained units, and unwisely the Government of the day sent them ill-trained units with the result that the war was prolonged. In the war between Russia and Japan the Russian Army was in most cases reinforced by incompletely-trained units, while it was invariably the case that the Japanese reinforced their Army by drafts who, placed alongside of well-seasoned men and under competent officers, were very soon as good a fighting force as before the wastage had taken place. In the late war in South Africa he saw battalions which had been depleted—the Highland Brigade—within a very few months after drafts had been sent out to them. With those men fighting alongside of seasoned men and under competent officers, the brigade was just as useful a fighting force as before. Therefore, the argument that these battalions would be weak because the men were not trained under their own officers as units was one which would not bear close investigation. The scheme would largely increase the capacity for reinforcing the Army by drafts in time of war. The experiment was well worth making. It in no way suggested the abolition of the Militia. He appealed to all persons connected with the Militia to sink any prejudices and any feeling that they were going to be abolished, and to do their utmost to induce their officers to make the force a second line, which, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, in time of emergency would undoubtedly come forward and help the first line. Let them make it what the right hon. Gentleman desired it should be, a force for home defence, and which, being a force properly organised, would be ready in time of emergency to go to the seat of war.

SIR GILBERT PARKER said the Secretary of State for War had sometimes ironically suggested that no two Members agreed in their criticisms. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would be inclined to admit that no two Members agreed in their defence of his scheme. The hon. Member for East Edinburgh, and the hon. and gallant Member for the Chippenham Division both thought that they interpreted the mind of the Secretary of State for War, but they had made speeches which were entirely contradictory. The hon. Member for East Edinburgh had said that the Militia was to be wiped out because the special contingent was going to absorb the men. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to assent to that statement, and then the hon. and gallant Member said that the Militia was not to be destroyed. He himself thought it was to die. If the men were going into the special contingent how could they go into the Territorial Army? He thought the two things were absolutely irreconcilable. Did anyone suggest that the Militia was going into the special contingent as a unit? Surely that was impossible. If the unit of the Militia went into the Territorial Army as the special contingent were they going to recruit it from the same class of people as in the past? The hon. and gallant Gentleman had said they were going to recruit from the same class of people as the Volunteers. He did not think that was possible, but if it was, it would mean that the special contingent and the Volunteers would be competing for recruits from the same class. The fact was that they placed the Militia in an impossible position if they attempted to reconcile those two propositions. He did not believe the right hon. Gentleman intended to do that. He hoped it would be made clear, because those who were anxious to understand the proposals were not able to follow the conflicting defences made by supporters of the right hon. Gentleman. He had believed from the beginning that the county association had in it the germ of exceedingly good work, but not as applied to the Territorial Force which the right hon. Gentleman had projected. If that scheme, which had its proper foundation in county sympathy and support, had been applied to the Militia instead of to the newly-formed Territorial Force, a very successful result would probably have been obtained. The right hon. Gentleman's idea seemed to be thoroughly sound, because it was based on the fact that the county would take an interest in a force which was wedded to the traditions, history, and life of the county. The right hon. Gentleman had thought to make it applicable to the Volunteers as well. Therein he had made a fundamental error. If he had tested the scheme by applying it to the Militia, and then, as a later development, applied it to the Volunteers as well, it was just possible that it might have met with success. He believed the scheme would break down because it was politically and socially unsound. The scheme itself was brilliant, but the highly-trained professional men who had prepared it had failed to grasp the political and social side of the question. The Under-Secretary of State for India had professed his utter disbelief in the future of the Militia, and thought the force ought to go. He did not understand the Secretary of State for War to say that the Militia ought to go. What he had said was that in its present form it ought to go, which was quite a different thing. The late Secretary of State for War had said that the Militia ought to be reconstructed. If the same support and attention had been given to the Militia as was now invited to be given to the Territorial Force, he believed that it could have been reconstructed and rejuvenated in such a manner as to provide the required drafts in a better way than was proposed in connection with the special contingent. As it was, the Secretary of State was speculating on getting the men from the special contingent. The right hon. Gentleman had to face the fact that he was not at the present time receiving throughout the country the support of the officers of the Militia and Yeomanry, and, largely, of the Volunteers. He did not think there was any Member on that side of the House who did not deeply regret that that was so, because it had been the unhappy fate of successive War Ministers to face this hitherto insoluble problem. The mover of the Amendment had reminded them that 120,000 of the Militia were used in connection with the recent war in South Africa. Surely hon. Gentlemen would not suggest that we were not getting full value for our money expended on those 120,000 men. He supported his hon. friend's Amendment, because he believed that this new scheme would fail, and because it was an attempt to do the impossible, viz., to democratise the Army, which was not possible at the present time. It could not satisfy hon. Members on either side of the House, because they variously interpreted the real intention of the right hon. Gentleman. He would like to ask if it was the case, as the hon. Member for East Edinburgh had stated, that the Militia were to be obliterated, and to become part of the special service contingent, or whether they were to be absorbed in the Territorial Army.

*SIR C. DILKE said that although he agreed with some of the arguments used in support of it by the Leader of the Opposition, he would oppose the Amendment. If we were to have the county associations, the Militia and the Yeomanry as county forces were peculiarly forces which must come under those associations. So far as debate went this was a most useful Amendment for the purpose of eliciting the views of the Government, which at present on this question were a little nebulous. What he wanted was an explanation of the split which was made in the present argument of the Government between the Militia recruits who were to be sent into the nucleus Regular battalions and were to be called Regulars, and the Militia battalions as such which continued to exist in Ireland, and were intended to exist in England under Clause 12. There was a course of double dealing on this question. It was dealt with under Clause 32, in Part III. of the Bill, and partly by Clause 12. By Clause 32 special reservists might be formed into regiments, battalions, and other military bodies. That was held in some degree to constitute a resurrection of the Militia. Clause 12 said it should be lawful to accept the offer of any part of the Territorial Force to serve outside the United Kingdom. In his view the solution of the question lay in clearing up the difficulties under Clause 12 and making the future of the Militia as a portion of the Territorial Army quite plain. In his opinion the Bill would never become law in its present form.

*MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) agreed that it was very difficult to grasp what was the exact attitude of the Government on this question. The Under-Secretary for India held that the Militia was a useless fighting force, and ought to be done away with, while other Ministerialists held that it would still remain under the new scheme.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he was only quoting the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Croydon.

*MR. HICKS BEACH said that the Under-Secretary for India seemed highly to approve of those views. But he would remind the Committee that the Militia had never failed in a crisis since its reorganisation; and no campaign had been carried to a successful termination without their aid. During the South Afrcian War 46,562 Militiamen served in the United Kingdom, 45,566 in South Africa, and 5,922 in the garrisons in the Mediterranean and Egypt. Those all relieved the fighting line, and it was not correct to assume that the services of the Militia in South Africa were unworthy of praise. He reminded the Committee that of the 45,566 men of the Militia who served in South Africa, 226 officers and 345 non-commissioned officers and men were mentioned in despatches. That was a fair proportion of the total number employed. They had been told that though the Militia would not retain their present unit they would still remain in their individual capacity part of the Territorial Army. But it should not be forgotten that one of the chief reasons why men joined the Militia force was that they got 1s. per day and rations, and at the end of the training a bounty of 30s., two shirts, two pairs of socks, and a pair of boots, while after serving a year in the force they got bounties of £1 in October, December, and February. Those were the inducements which attracted the present class of men to the Militia, but under the inducements held out in regard to the special contingent and the Territorial Army they would not get the same kind of man who now joined the Militia Force. But even supposing they did, would the special contingent be of as much value as a fighting force as the present body? He could not see how the special contingent were to be made a much more efficient fighting force than the Militia if they were only to have twenty-one days annual training instead of twenty-eight. How many of the special contingent would be effective to serve abroad in case of war? They would join at seventeen and be eligible to serve abroad after they had done their first six months training when their age would be seventeen and a half years, but under the King's Regulations no one could serve abroad under the age of twenty. He did not see how the War Office could get 30,000 men out of the special contingent to take the place of those they removed by abolishing the Militia as a fighting force. It was said by hon. Gentlemen that they did not want to destroy the Militia, but everybody knew that it was in a bad state, and therefore they would have nothing more to do with it. He objected to that statement, because he held that if certain moderate reforms were carried out the Militia could be made a much more efficient force than it was to-day. At present the recruiting system was most objectionable. The recruiting sergeant received 1s. 6d. for a recruit for the Militia and 2s. 6d. for a recruit for the Line. It was therefore the interest of every recruiting sergeant to make every recruit go at first through the Militia and then to pass from the Militia into the Army. In that way he got both the 1s. 6d. and the 2s. 6d. The present was a very fallacious system because a great many recruits went into the Militia who never had the smallest intention of remaining in it. It also had a very serious result in that it prevented a large number of young men from joining the Militia because they thought that when they got to the depot they would be driven into the Line by the pressure of the non-commissioned officers. If they did away with the bounty, for so it might be called, given to the recruiting sergeant, and if they could compel every man who enlisted in the Militia to go through at least one training before joining the Regular Army, they would get a large number of troops both in the Militia and in the Line which they did not get now. They would get those recruits who were now afraid to join the Militia because they did not wish to be forced into the Army, and they would also get those who, having done one month's soldiering in the Militia, and finding it to their liking, would of their own accord join the Regular Army. In other words they would get the men who wanted to pass into the Army and also the men who did not wish to be bullied into the line, while the Regular Army would benefit by men who were determined to enter the force coming forward directly instead of passing through the Militia as a preliminary step. The Secretary of State for War last year adopted a very useful reform in regard to the preliminary drill of Militiamen. In the year 1905–6 the battalion with which he was acquainted raised 105 recruits. Out of those 105, twenty-nine went into the Army, seventeen were discharged by purchase, and owing to various other casualties a total of fifty-seven had disappeared from the Militia and only forty-eight remained. In the last year (1906–7) under the system of enabling recruits to be trained at battalion headquarters instead of at the regimental depot, although the method had only been in existence six months, they raised 150 recruits. Forty-one purchased their discharges or went into the Line, and that left them with 109 recruits. That showed what had been done in consequence of the initiation of that useful reform. It had been said that though they might not wish to destroy the Militia it was no use tinkering with them any more. He maintained, however, that if that reform could be extended, and if the still greater reform of introducing six months preliminary training in the winter were carried out, the number of recruits would be still further increased and the Militia made a much more efficient force than it was at the present time, and a force of much more value than the special contingent was ever likely to be.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton), speaking on his own behalf only, said that he proposed to vote for the Amendment. He agreed that the War Secretary's scheme was a very brilliant one, but he was strongly of opinion that the right hon. Gentleman knew very little about the material which composed the Militia. It was a well-known fact among those who knew anything about the working class that the force was drawn largely, if not entirely, from the rollicking, happy-go-lucky unskilled workers, who entered it for various reasons. Some went into it to have a holiday, and others because of slack times. So far as the skilled workers were concerned, if they had any military ambition they joined the Volunteers or, if that did not satisfy their ambition, the Regular Forces. Very seldom did they join the ranks of the Militia. As at present constituted the Militia was a valuable addition or ally to the Army. Many of the men who joined it—and the best men, because it was admitted that the harum scarum man made the best fighter—after serving some little time with the force developed a desire to become soldiers, and entered the Regular Army. The present Militia acted in that way as a weeding out force. If some of the men who entered it went straight into the Army they would be more costly than valuable—they would spend more time in the guard-room than anywhere else. For these reasons, knowing something of the class from which the Militia were drawn, he supported the Amendment.

*MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean in his concluding words had suggested that instead of raising the question at this point they should put down Amendments to Clause 12. That was a very important clause, no doubt, because it dealt with the terms on which the men of the Territorial Force should enlist. It was to the effect that they should be enlisted for service in the United Kingdom, but at the same time everybody knew that they would be sent abroad when war broke out, because the clause authorised His Majesty to accept their services under certain conditions. Owing, however, to the beneficent provisions of the automatic closure Resolution, that clause would be taken at the end of the fourth day in Committee and would never be discussed at all. Moreover, from the provisions of that Resolution it would not be discussed on Report. Such were the disadvantages of closuring an important Bill like that under discussion in regard to which there was no intention to obstruct. The Amendments put down were genuine Amendments, and they all hoped to assist His Majesty's Government to increase the efficiency of the forces of the Crown. It appeared to him that the point to which the argument of the right hon. Member for the Newport Division of Shropshire was addressed was the real point in the discussion. The Government proposal was to abolish the Militia, and the question was whether their proposals would give the country a better force than that which they proposed to do away with. If he could prove that the new force would be better than the old Militia he would be glad to vote with the right hon.

Gentleman, but if he could not prove that he thought the Amendment ought to stand. It was perfectly clear that the Militia were quite ready to serve abroad and the commanding officers had said so, but what they objected to was drafting. If the Militia were willing to serve abroad, and he thought it would be admitted that the military operations in which we were likely to be engaged would occur abroad, the force could supplement the Regular Army in time of war. The Militia Force consisted of men who were willing to serve abroad as units. But what was the force to be transformed into? As he understood it they were to be transformed into two separate bodies. They were to be transformed into the third battalion or as units to form a portion of the new Territorial Army. As a force he thought the third battalion was hardly worth criticising, because it could not be seriously contended that they could take boys of seventeen, put them under discipline for six months, train them for twenty-one days a year, and then say that they were fit for first class reservists and substitute them for the veteran men of seven or three years service who were now our first line of attack or defence in any war. He thought the proposal of the Government showed that they were not dealing with the matter seriously. He had endeavoured to point out that the men who joined the Territorial Army were engaged specifically by the State on the understanding that they were only to serve in the United Kingdom. The State laid that down, and ordinary men would naturally imagine that the State would keep faith with them. Everyone knew what happened in the past to the Militia. When war broke out the Militia had been obliged to volunteer for foreign service whether they wanted to or not. The new Territorial Army they were going to treat in exactly the same way as the old Militia. If Clause 12 was carried in the shape the right hon. Gentleman wished it seemed to him there would not be any force to go abroad to support the Regular Army in times of emergency. Under that clause the right hon. Gentleman did not say, as he might, that in time of peace the War Office should arrange that certain battalions or regiments of the new Force should go abroad on foreign service, but in all probability war would break out and we should then have to organise these units of the Territorial Force, a proceeding which seemed to him very unbusinesslike. The suggestion he desired to make would be shut out on Clause 2, but he hoped the Government would entertain the proposal that a proportion of the new Territorial Force should from the beginning be composed exclusively of men who on enlistment undertook the obligation to serve abroad. He trusted the Government would see their way on Report to modify Clause 12 and give the country some force, if this Amendment was not carried, that would take the place of the old Militia. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted that the Regular Force was sadly deficient in men, and that therefore we must have some system to supply drafts, and upon that he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the present was an opportune moment to reduce that force by 400 officers and 40,000 men.

MR. GUY BARING (Winchester) urged the Secretary of State that he should give the Committee some further justification for the hope he had expressed that under his scheme he would have as many battalions as possible for drafts, for garrisoning our home stations, and for guarding lines of communication as he had had in the past. He did not believe he would He did not believe in the theory of provisional battalions. There was no precedent for it. During the whole of the South African War, when the war fever was at its height and recruiting at its best, only six provisional battalions were formed. All the recruits that came forward were absorbed by the Home battalions or at the seat of war. He would like to point out also how poetic justice had overtaken the Secretary of State. The right hon. Gentleman was now asking for drafts and battalions when he had already, by tampering with the Guards, destroyed the best reserve we had ever had and the only battalion which in the history of the British Army had been at such a strength that they could keep two battalions abroad and one at home at war strength.

MR. HALDANE: Does the hon. Gentleman say that those battalions could find drafts?

MR. GUY BARING: They could form new battalions.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 80; Noes, 260. (Division List No. 183).

## AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.Sir AlexF.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcrares, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish,Rt.Hon. Victor C.W
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A. (Wor.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn.J. (Birm'gh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert (Lanark,G'van
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn. Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson,Wm.G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Seddon, J.
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walker,Col.W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. F. E. Smith and Viscount Castlereagh.

## NOES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith,Rt.Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams (Devonp't
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H. (Essex,Romf'd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duckworth, James
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Gardner,Col.Alan (Hereford,S.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Lief (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

*VISCOUNT VALENTIA (Oxford) moved to insert after the word "Regulars" the words "and Yeomanry" with the object of excluding the Yeomanry from the operation of the clause. He said that, in doing so, he did not wish to urge the smallest objection to the principle of the Bill. On the contrary, he thought that if the right hon. Gentleman's proposal were to start a second Army *de novo*, the principle of the Bill was an ideal one. The object of his Amendment was to preserve a force which was just now allowed to be efficient, and to protest against the scheme which, in so far as it concerned that force, could not make it better, and which, if it did not commend itself to the men now serving in the Yeomanry, would lead to the substitution of a force inferior in strength and efficiency to that which they already possessed. He had served for many years in the Yeomanry, and he understood its constitution and the feeling of those who served in its ranks; he also knew the methods by which the Yeomanry had arrived at its present strength and the secret of its enlistment to that strength. The Yeomanry, he thought he was safe in saying, never was so strong, so efficient, and so well officered as at present. He did not say they were perfect; he did not think that could be said of any auxiliary force; but he did say with confidence that they were still improving. Many of the Yeomanry regiments were now up to their full establishment, and many of them could still further recruit under the existing conditions of service if they were allowed to do so. The actual strength of the Yeomanry force now stood at 92·2 per cent. of its establishment, which compared very favourably with the state of any other branch of the Regular or Auxiliary Forces. Did the right hon. Gentleman think that he would secure greater efficiency in the cavalry of the Territorial Force from the same men trained annually for a less number of days than at present? He said in his Memorandum on the Military Forces that "the Militia and Yeomanry, as they at present exist, are quite unfit to take the field against European troops." Did the right hon. Gentleman think that the Territorial cavalry would be quite fit to undergo that trial when drilled for a shorter time than the Yeomanry now were, with the assistance of possibly a Solicitor-Adjutant instead of a Regular officer? Did the right hon. Gentleman and his military advisers think that they could keep up the strength of the Territorial Cavalry Force to the same level as that at which the Yeomanry now stood, when they reduced their pay by 2s. 10d. a day, with the loss of such characteristics as the regimental title and uniform to which they attached an important, though perhaps a sentimental, value? He was quite sure that if the Bill passed, and it was decided to include the Yeomanry in the general scheme, the right hon. and learned Gentleman might count upon the loyal co-operation of the officers, and that they would combine with the county associations to do their best to make it work, and use every exertion to fill the ranks of the Territorial cavalry; but he could not but see the difficulty that they would have to face, and he was extremely doubtful of their success. He had within the last few days seen many Yeomanry officers, both those belonging to the regiment in which he had so long served and others, and he had found that the majority of them shared his apprehensions. He was unable to see what advantage was expected from the inclusion of the Yeomanry in the scheme contemplated in the Bill. If there was any prospect of improvement, he would not dream of such an Amendment as he proposed. All that he could see to be said for it was that it would tend to uniformity in the Territorial Army, and might produce a reduction in cost; but of that he was by no means assured. For the sake of uniformity he did not think any convulsion of the present Yeomanry system was worth while. Uniformity was conspicuously absent from any present military system, as the many and varied conditions under which the men now served amply showed, and the economy which would be achieved was, he could not but think, visionary. It was proposed to reduce the Yeoman's pay by 2s. 10d. a day, but it had to be remembered that when he joined the Territorial Force he would be entitled to a far more complete and expensive kit than that now supplied to him by the public. At present nothing was found for him beyond his cloth clothes, but when enlisted on a Militia basis, he concluded that a free full kit would be supplied to him, which would much discount the saving made from the 2s. 10d. by which his pay was to be cut. If that were so, he did not think the advantages to be desired from uniformity and economy were worth considering, and he did not know that any other could be urged. The disadvantages appeared to him both many and great. There was every probability that many of the present Yeomen would not accept the terms offered to the territorial cavalry, so that the numbers of the new force would fall short of the present Yeomanry strength. It might be said, that if those men would not serve at the new rate of pay, there were plenty of others that would. That might be so, but he thought it reasonable to suppose that they would probably be men of inferior social status to the present Yeomen, and, if so, they would detract from the number who might be expected to enlist in the territorial infantry, being the class now serving in the Militia.

Then he had gathered from what the right hon. Gentleman had said in the House that men enlisted previous to the date when the Bill came into force would serve their time under their then contract. The effect of that would be that in the event of present Yeomen re-engaging they would be serving at 2s. 8d. a day for one, two, or it might be nearly three years alongside of comrades drawing 5s. 6d., the former being the old soldiers, and naturally appraising themselves higher than recruits. The odious comparison thus obtained would not lead to the number of re-engagements which were so much to be desired, if not essential to the effective working of the scheme. To avoid that anomalous state of things it seemed to him that the only course open to the right hon. Gentleman was to allow the old conditions to go on till the latest contracts, made before the enforcement of the Act, expired, and then to start his territorial cavalry under the new terms of enlistment. That he regarded as inevitable, as it seemed to him of the highest importance to encourage re-engagement of present Yeomen as much as possible if the new force was to be a success. If that were so the Yeomen would go on under their present engagement for three years after the passing of that Bill. In that time much might happen. It was possible that by then His Majesty might be advised by other statesmen than those who now adorned the Ministerial Benches, with views on Army matters which did not coincide with those of the present Government. But even if the territorial scheme of the right hon. Gentleman held the field, there seemed to him no reason why the Yeomanry, as at present constituted, should not still, as he proposed in his Memorandum, "form the cavalry of the Territorial Force," be under the administrative control of the county associations, maintaining their present strength and efficiency, and, to use his own words, "assist in the realisation of the scheme which is that the Territorial Force shall be in itself an army complete in the various arms and organisations as nearly as possible upon the same pattern as the Regular troops." The case of the Yeomanry was wholly distinct from that of the Militia and the Volunteers. He knew little or nothing of the Auxiliary Forces beyond what was known to every hon. Member of the Committee. He believed that in the Militia there was a lamentable shortage of men, and the Volunteers experienced a corresponding lack of officers. No doubt the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman would to some extent make good the deficiencies in the forces which he proposed to create by the Bill, but the Yeomanry were entirely differently situated. The Yeomanry for many years, thanks to the energy of the officers who served in it and the generous encouragement given to it by the War Office, since the South African War had been steadily increasing in strength and efficiency. It was well officered, and the force all round was a credit to the counties in which it was raised upon a genuine territorial basis. They knew the capabilities of that force, which he did not think could be exceeded by any territorial cavalry created under the proposed scheme, which would be trained less and paid worse. He had listened most carefully to the right hon. Gentleman's remarks and the reasons he had given for rejecting the last Amendment in regard to the Militia, but he did not think any one of the powerful arguments used could possibly be urged against the Amendment which he now proposed. Such conditions as the Secretary of State for War had described in the Militia did not exist in the case of the Yeomanry. They were short of men in the Militia, but there were plenty of men in the Yeomanry. They were short of officers in the Volunteers, but there were plenty in the Yeomanry. They were a cavalry force ready to his hand, and it seemed a very unwise thing that the right hon. Gentleman should not make full use of it and let well alone. In the hope that the right hon. Gentleman and the Committee would recognise the danger of sacrificing a bird in the hand while there was hardly one and certainly not two in the bush, and the folly of throwing away the bone for the shadow, he begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 1, line 8, after the word 'Regulars' to insert the words 'and Yeomanry.'"—(*Viscount Valentia.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HALDANE said that if anybody could induce the Committee to give different treatment to the Yeomanry than was proposed for the Militia it would be the noble Lord, who had one of the best of records as a Yeomanry officer, and he knew from personal experience that a high sense of duty was associated with the officers and men of the noble Lord's regiment. But the question was not one merely of uniformity and economy; it was a question of introducing system where confusion now reigned and of organising efficiency where, through no fault of individuals, it did not now exist. The functions of cavalry were now more precise than they were in old days, and it was clear that there was necessity for training in combination with other branches of the military services, and for the first time the Yeomanry would be given that training. The training would not be quite so long, but it would be much more systematic under the eyes of the general staff. In no part of the work of organisation carried out by the general staff had the result been more striking than in relation to the cavalry, and the functions it would have to perform in the Territorial Force, differing in some respects from those of the Regulars, but of the same pattern. The cavalry would be organised in three sections. One class would be called the strategical cavalry, which would operate ahead of the main force, probably upon the flank of the enemy, and must be extremely mobile and accustomed to work with artillery. The second class would be the screen cavalry interposed between the advancing force and the enemy's force; and then there would be the cavalry to work with the main force. Those were distinctly new functions which were not defined until the general staff worked them out, and they were instances of the actual advance which had been made within the last three months. He invited the Committee to look at the bearing of that upon the position of the Yeomanry. The Yeomanry force could no longer be regarded as being "in the air," for they must be trained to fulfil their function with the divisions of the Home Army. He wished this second line force as nearly as possible to be moulded upon the same principles as the first line, and to correspond to its organisation so that it would be a real support should the emergency arise. That was why they could not keep up the Yeomanry as they were at the present time. It was true the pay would be cut down; but how could a state of things be justified in which men engaged in the same service received pay largely in excess of that of their comrades? Unless they were in earnest in carrying out their intentions they could not make the organisation work. The rate of pay must be the same throughout the service. In the event of war the difference in pay would operate badly, and had so operated; it would introduce discontent and unrest and mar the good effect intended. With proper equipment there was no reason to doubt that the Yeomanry would become more efficient. He also saw the possibility of giving the Yeomanry a more thorough training. Their present training, he was advised, rendered it impossible for them to be quite an efficient force. There would under the new arrangement be a possibility of giving a far better training than at the present time. One of the deficiencies of the Yeomanry and which rendered it impossible for it to be an effective force would disappear when it was combined with other arms according to a system which had been carefully thought out. To his mind it would be fatal to accept the Amendment. They would create unrest between the two lines by the differential treatment, and they would be doing the Yeomanry themselves the worst service. There would be a transition period from the old to the new, and he had no doubt that, actuated in the high spirit in which the noble Lord had spoken, the force would observe the new conditions. Notwithstanding the gloomy views of the noble Lord, he had no fear but that the Territorial Force would do their duty.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said the argument that the Yeomanry could not go into combined training did not hold good. There was nothing to prevent it. Several Yeomanry regiments, he believed, had already undergone a certain amount of instruction in work with artillery and infantry. Apparently the real argument which had decided the right hon. Gentleman was that of pay. He could not see his way to paying 5s. a day. Personally, he was one of those who felt sure that in a few years under the new treatment the Yeomanry would disappear. An enormous improvement had taken place in the force since he first knew it, and it seemed a great pity that an efficient force, or at any rate a force which had attained to a very considerable standard of efficiency, should be sacrificed. The argument that the Militia were not efficient could not be applied to the Yeomanry. The Yeomanry cost 14s. per head less than the Militia, and numbered, according to the latest Returns, 25,000 effectives. They would not object to serving with the Territorial Army under the county associations, but they should be left as a distinct force. It was quite true that some Yeomen at the end of a training went away with £7 in their pockets, but those were exceptional cases. It was admitted that if a man was to do the work incidental to cavalry training he must be given more pay than the infantry man. It should be remembered that he had to groom and water his horse and clean his saddlery as well as his own kit. If they were to pay a cavalry soldier only 2d. or 3d. a day more than the infantry man in the Territorial Army they were not likely to get many to join the mounted corps. One of the most astonishing things nowadays was the small number of people, even among farmers' sons, who could ride, and on account of his inevitable physical discomfort, he pitied the Yeoman who could not ride after his first day's training. Let the Committee imagine a man in that condition having to set to work on the numerous duties which would fall to his lot. At the end of the training it was pretty certain he would strongly advise his friends to stick to walking. The Yeomanry officers would be downhearted at the results year by year getting worse, and the end would be the sacrifice of a force of which most of their officers were proud.

MR. GUEST (Cardiff District) said he had heard the speech of the Secretary of State for War with great regret. He had understood that the right hon. Gentleman was reconsidering the attitude which he took up when he first introduced his scheme. He did not understand the present attitude of the Secretary of State. He had set his heart on the creation of a Territorial Army, and the first thing he did was to jeopardise the part most difficult to create. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman would say that the Yeomanry was not an efficient arm. If that was his opinion, he hoped he would have the candour to say so, and they would understand that he did not view with much regret its possible disappearance; but if the right hon. Gentleman regarded the Yeomanry as an efficient body, surely there was nothing which he could put in its place which would be as good for the purpose he had in hand. He assumed from what had been said that the right hon. Gentleman admitted that the Yeomanry was a satisfactory force as at present constituted. What was the opinion of the Yeomanry officers in the House? He did not believe there was a single officer who would not say that in his judgment, if the right hon. Gentleman's scheme was carried out, the Yeomanry would disappear altogether. The right hon. Gentleman would smash the Yeomanry as one would smash an egg with a hammer. If the right hon. Gentleman did not think so, could he produce anybody who had served in the Yeomanry who was of a different opinion?

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N,): I have served in the Yeomanry, and I am of a different opinion.

MR. GUEST said the right hon. Gentleman was fortunate in having one supporter. There were always two opinions. He ventured to say that 99 per cent. of the Yeomanry officers were of opinion that the force would be destroyed. He was at a loss to understand why the pay of the Yeomanry should be reduced. What on earth did the right hon. Gentleman think he would gain by introducing uniformity into his Territorial Army which would be comparable with the loss sustained by the destruction of the Yeomanry? The idea of combined training and having all arms represented in the Territorial Army was invaluable, but those advantages would wholly disappear if, in the result, one of the arms—cavalry—was wholly wanting. If the pay of the Yeomanry was reduced, as was now proposed, in case of emergency they would have to pay them 10s. a day instead of 5s. That was proved to be the case during the South African War. The right hon. Gentleman could not have had experience of the difficulty of recruiting for the Yeomanry, and if the pay of the men was reduced the force would dwindle and ultimately disappear as an effective unit. He had spoken feelingly and perhaps too strongly; but he had a very keen interest in this branch of the service, and it was because he had at heart the success of the Territorial Army that he did not want to see the cavalry part of it destroyed. The right hon. Gentleman had been introducing economies into Army administration, and he hoped that he would further reduce the Regular forces so that he would have more money to assist the Territorial Army. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman generally, but he hoped that he would yet relent in regard to his economies on the Yeomanry, which, if insisted on, would be absolutely fatal to his own scheme. If the right hon. Gentleman adhered to his position, he (Mr. Guest) would vote for the Amendment.

*Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.) said he hoped and trusted that the Territorial Army would be a success, and he would do everything he could to support it. When he first joined the Yeomanry ten years ago, when they went into training the men were billeted; but now they were encamped, and their horses were picketed in the open. The conditions of training were, therefore, entirely different, consequently the remark of the hon. Member for North Buckinghamshire was hardly relevant, as he had no experience of existing conditions. The Secretary for War had asked how they could put two men side by side, the Cavalry soldier paid at the rate of 1s. 2d. per day, and a Yeomanry soldier paid at the rate of 5s. per day? But the right hon. Gentleman had entirely forgotten that the first contingent of Yeomanry who were sent out to South Africa were paid at Cavalry rates; and it was only when they went to street corners and picked up all the rag-tag and bob-tail for the second contingent that they had to pay 5s. a day to induce the men to join. In case of war the men did not care for pay; patriotism was their first consideration. But in peace training the men came out, not so much from a patriotic point of view, as for the purpose of an outing. He did not think that the right hon. Gentleman had really considered the different classes of Yeomanry. For instance, Lord Lovat's Scouts in Scotland could not be compared with the West Kent Yeomanry to which he belonged; they were an entirely different class of men. The former were made up of gillies and keepers who rode on rough ponies, and no doubt made excellent scouts and mounted Infantry. On the other hand, the Southern regiments of Yeomanry were made up of men of the very best class. With all due respect to the Volunteers, he ventured to think that there was no force in the country of so good a class as the Yeomanry. If the right hon. Gentleman desired to make those men pay out of their own pockets for their training, which they regarded as a cheap and pleasant holiday, the present men would not come out. He might be able to recruit a certain number of men called Yeomanry under his territorial scheme, but if the conditions were made harder and less comfortable, he would not obtain the same class of men. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would yet reconsider his decision. In regard to combined training, at present the training lasted eighteen days, but during that period they were entitled to so much leave in order to look after their business either on their farms or in town. Under the new scheme the period of training was to be reduced to fourteen days, and he would like to know what was proposed in regard to leave during that period. Again, in regard to combined training there were all sorts of conditions which a commanding officer of a Yeomanry regiment had to take into consideration in calling the men out, such as the hay harvest and other agricultural exigencies. He was sure that there was no officer who would not welcome any scheme for combined training, but the special conditions under which Yeomanry regiments had to come out must be taken into consideration. At the present time the Yeomanry were under the General Staff of the Army, and his experience was that they were inspected by one or two generals who came down for that purpose during each training. Surely, therefore, they came under the General Staff, and he did not see how they could be more under that staff under a Territorial scheme. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would realise that he could not class and deal with the Yeomanry in one lump. He must consider the differences which existed in regiments and one might even say the differences which existed in squadrons. In his own regiment, for example, they had squadrons drawn from agricultural districts and others drawn from London districts. He thought no one would disagree with him when he said that if they obtained young men from London—telegraph clerks and others engaged in similar occupations in London or the suburbs—and made them able to use the rifle, and carry out the functions of a cavalry soldier, they were conferring a great benefit not only upon them but upon the community at large. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider his decision so as not to discourage that particular class.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R. Holderness) also urged the Government to reconsider this question. Every Yeomanry officer thoughout the country would agree with the speech made by the hon. Member for Cardiff. They believed that the right hon. Gentleman's scheme if it included the Yeomanry would mean the ruin of that force. He did not speak in any Party spirit, as he was not opposed to the right hon. Gentleman's scheme. He believed there was a great deal of good in it, but on this particular point he was in utter disagreement with the Government. The Yeomanry, as at present constituted, had worked extremely well. As the Member for Horncastle had pointed out, it was the one great success of Mr. Brodrick's Army scheme. When that scheme was brought in the Yeomanry numbered some 9,000 men, and at the present time they were somewhere about 24,000. He had the honour of holding a commission in one of the regiments formed under Mr. Brodrick's scheme, and that regiment had proved a great success. On Friday next they would be going out for their fifth annual training, and he wished the Secretary for War could go and see for himself the work done by the regiment. He entirely disagreed with the assertion that the Yeomanry did not undergo an effective training. If the War Secretary would take an excursion to Scarborough next week they would show him something which would open his eyes considerably as to what a Yeoman did on his annual training. He would see a regiment which was unquestionably as efficient as any in the country. The right hon. Gentleman had said that his main objection to the Yeomanry regiments was that they did not go in for combined training: that showed how little he had studied the subject. If he had looked into it he would have found out that there were three regiments in the north of England, including his (the hon. Member's) own, which had trained together, and with artillery. He did not, however, claim for his regiment that it was the only efficient one, as he asserted that all the Yeomanry regiments were efficient. But the Government would not improve those regiments if they reduced their pay, because such a step would damp the enthusiasm of the men. The right hon. Gentleman had mentioned the case of a man who took away £7 from his annual training, but £5 of that would be for his horse, that being the almost universal charge for a horse for the period. Therefore, while he might receive £7, only 30s. or £2 would go into his own pocket. Up to the present the Yeomanry had been enabled to appeal to a different class of men from those who were attracted by the Militia and the Volunteers. If all these forces were placed upon the same basis, however, they would all have to appeal to the same class of men. If the right hon. Gentleman would go north as he had suggested he could show him the different classes of men they appealed to. He had one squadron, a town squadron, which appealed to a totally different class of men from the Volunteers. The commanding officer of the district when they started the squadron expressed the fear that it might seriously affect the recruiting for the Volunteers, but that gallant officer had told him since that it had not had the slightest effect upon Volunteer recruiting as they attracted a different class of men altogether. The men in the Yeomanry force up to the present time had shown the greatest keenness, and had done good work, and he earnestly appealed to the Secretary of State for War not to interfere with the force as it stood at the present moment. There had been an appeal, in which every commanding officer of Yeomanry had joined, to the right hon. Gentleman not to include that force in his scheme, and he thought that some consideration should be given to an appeal of that nature. The right hon. Gentleman had listened so far as to allow them to go on recruiting on the old terms for three years, and a good deal might happen in that period; they might even be deprived of the presence of the right hon. Gentleman on the Treasury bench, and have someone there who would treat the Yeomanry with greater fairness.

*MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said he had had the honour to serve in the Yeomanry in past years although he regretted that he was not a member of the force at present. He did not think that ruin and reorganisation were the same thing, and this Bill was intended not to ruin, but to reorganise the Yeomanry. He did not think that the Government intended to do anything to interfere with the success of the Yeomanry. He believed that the change which would, under the Government scheme, come about in a very few years would give the Yeomanry an opportunity to do even better work than it was now doing for the country. There was one thing about which every Yeoman was very keen, and that was that serious and responsible work should be given them to do, and that class of work was going to be given to them in the new Territorial Force. He could not read in the Bill anything approaching to the ruin of the Yeomanry. If he rightly read the second clause, it would be the duty of the County Associations to ascertain the military resources of the county, and they all knew how necessary that was because the military resources of each county differed widely according to the nature of the county and the habits of those who lived there. In some counties there was always hunting going on, and in counties like Buckinghamshire there were a number of skilled men who understood horses and other matters which would be useful in the service. He, however, also wanted to appeal to the Government on the question of pay. In the Yeoman they had a man ready at any time of the year to serve his country with a horse. It was true than the man with his horse only went out for training for a few days in the year, but still they were always ready. What he wished to urge was that the Government should not attempt to buy retail at wholesale prices. The cavalry soldier had his pay all the year round and had a pension to look forward to, and in order to be a soldier he did not give up a remunerative occupation as the Yeoman did. They all knew that the Yeoman, while he was serving his country, would have been, during that time, remuneratively employed, and, in order to go through their training many of them gave up what to them was a considerable sum of money. He did not appeal for high pay, but he asked that the Yeoman should not be paid at the rate of the cavalry soldier in the Regulars, but have higher pay when he came out in time of peace. When on active service together no soldier would wish to have anything better than his comrade. He asked his right hon. friend seriously to consider whether he was not trying to get at a wholesale price a retail article when he asked the Yeomanry to come out for his training on the pay that a trooper in the dragoon regiments got. He would like to point out that a Yeomanry regiment depended for its efficiency largely on the capacity of its adjutant, and he doubted very much whether it was advisable to have any change in the adjutants of those regiments which might tend to make them less efficient. The increased efficiency of the Yeomanry had in recent years been proved by the fact that they did such excellent work in South Africa. He claimed to be as keen an old Yeoman as any one in the country, and he had the greatest possible desire for the maintenance of the success and efficiency of that force.

*COLONEL WARDE (Kent, Medway) said he would like to add a word to the appeal that had been made to the Secretary of State for War in this matter. He had listened to the right hon. Gentleman's arguments and had failed to find one to show that if the Yeomanry was reorganised in the way proposed it would become more efficient than it was to-day. He had had some experience of the matter, having served as the adjutant of his regiment a quarter of a century ago and having served for the last seven years in command of the same regiment. He well remembered in the dark days of the South African War the appeals made to the country. The War Office had only to place a sum of money in the hands of the Yeomanry officers and in six weeks they produced a force of 10,000 men as fine and as well equipped as any that had been sent to the front. Although they all believed the right hon. Gentleman's only desire was to improve their efficiency, he must have already heard that the very thought of their being placed under this different system had stopped recruiting altogether, and especially the recruiting of that part of the force from which they obtained the best non-commissioned officers. It took years to make a non-commissioned officer in the Army, but in the Yeomanry they were obliged to make them quickly, and they took them from the farmers and master tradesmen of the towns—men who were used to some responsibility. Those were the men who would volunteer when the time came, but who could not be expected to bind themselves down year in and year out to leave their business or occupation at any moment. No doubt training with other forces was a most valuable experience, but they could not be taught to run before they could walk, and when regard was had to the short time the regiment was called together to train, it would be seen that it was impossible to combine in that period more than the training necessary to make a good soldier. He reminded the Committee with regard to the rate of pay that a good deal more had to come out of the Yeoman's pay than out of the pay of the ordinary cavalry man. One thing that had to be remembered was that the soldier served all the year, the Yeoman received pay only for a fortnight, and the same rate of pay as was given to the cavalry man could not be considered sufficient, although in time of war the pay was not a matter of consideration to anybody. In his quota of the 10,000 men sent to South Africa he had a captain in the Militia, a naval officer, and a young country squire, and not any of the men he provided went to South Africa for the sake of the pay. It was true that the men sent out afterwards did, and the result was that they had all the scallywags in the country coming to learn to ride and shoot for the sake of 5s. a day. But they were found to be a very different class of men from those who were first sent out. Experience showed that if men were treated with consideration and common sense there was no difficulty in getting the right class of men in the Yeomanry. Many were men of independent means, who gave up their holiday in order to come out to train, and they ought to be treated differently from the rank and file of the cavalry regiments. Having regard to the wonderful improvements which had taken place in the last ten years, he thought the right hon. Gentleman would be well advised in accepting the Amendment of the noble Lord.

*MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that under this scheme they would practically destroy the Yeomanry, a force about which he knew something, because he had served in the north of Scotland, where the gillies, keepers, and shepherds went up for training, and where the money that they got was very useful to them. He had also served with the Shropshire Yeomanry, where they had exactly the reverse conditions—the kind of Yeomanry force in which the noble Lord the Member for Oxford had served for so many years. He would point out that in both those cases this scheme would destroy the two sorts of Yeomanry. In the case of the Lovat's Scouts, to which he belonged, in the north of Scotland, they were practically taking away from the men 3s. per day—money which they used to take home to help them through the winter. A good many of the men took home with them from £8 to £12. They could not expect men in that position to go on when they reduced their pay to the extent proposed. In reducing the pay of the Shropshire Yeomanry to that extent the result would be that, instead of being able to live on their pay, the men would have to live like the ordinary British Tommy, which he was quite sure they would decline to do, or they would have to spend a considerable sum out of their own pockets. Although no people were more patriotic than the Shropshire farmers, yet he did not believe that they would stand that for one moment. The Government were going to destroy both those classes of Yeomen, and he did not see how they were going to get out of it if they reduced the pay to the extent proposed. The Secretary of State for War had said that the Yeomanry did not get an efficient training. He thought that the Secretary for War ought to know what the Yeomanry went through in the way of training. At the present moment the regiment to which he belonged were preparing in Inverness-shire to invade

Perthshire, and he really did not think they could have any more effective training than that. Before they did away with what were practically the best of the Yeomen, they should remember that mounted infantry, which the Yeomen practically were at the present time, were an extremely useful arm. They could perform the duties of the advanced guard of an army, and those were the most difficult that they could ask any men to discharge. He had seen mounted infantry do advanced guard work and do it well after about four months of training. If they were going to do away with the Yeomanry to a great extent, they would have to increase their cavalry, which would cost them a great deal more. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman should consider very carefully before he did away with the Yeomanry. Even if they could get the infantry from the Territorial Army, what were they going to do without any form of cavalry? Of all the Auxiliary Forces it was generally allowed by the military experts, and even by the man in the street, that, on the whole, the Yeomanry were the most efficient. If the Secretary of State for War insisted on treating the Yeomanry in this way the result would be that he would have practically no mounted troops for his Territorial Army.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he had hoped that the Secretary for War would be able to fall in with the suggestion of his noble friend instead of taking up such a decided *non possumus* attitude on the subject. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had rather misunderstood one portion of the speech of his hon. friend, when he said that the Yeomanry had to be trained before they could fulfil their functions. Nothing which had been said that night, or by any Yeomanry officer, justified anybody in suggesting that the force was anything but willing and anxious to fulfil its functions. The Amendment had been moved on behalf of the Yeomanry force, because those who supported it believed that their exclusion from the Bill was the best way to ensure that they might be able to fulfil their functions. It dealt primarily with the question of control. Were the county associations the best organisations to deal with the Yeomanry force? He thought that there would be a great deal of technical difficulty connected with that point. There were certain counties which had Yeomanry, and there were counties which had a great many more Yeomanry than other counties; as the Bill was at present drafted, there was bound to be overlapping, and difficulties from that point of view. A man now serving in a particular cavalry regiment might be disqualified from doing so in future because he did not belong to a particular area of a particular county association.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: That is provided for in the Bill.

LORD BALCARRES said he did not think it was, but perhaps the hon. Gentleman in his reply would make that clear. It was a rather significant fact that not one Member who had spoken, except the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, had had one good word to say for this scheme from the point of view of the Yeomanry. The hon. Member for North Buckinghamshire had announced that he was going to support the Government, but his speech was a most damaging criticism of their proposal. As a Yeomanry officer the hon. Member professed goodwill towards the Bill, but there were plenty of other officers also who were naturally anxious that the scheme should be a success, because if it was not they all knew what, in two or three years time, the result might be. Practically the whole Yeomanry force were arrayed against the Government on the Bill as applied to themselves. It was common knowledge that the colonels commanding the Yeomanry regiments had unanimously informed the War Office that the scheme under which they would have to work in future, in their opinion, was extremely bad and dangerous for the Yeomanry. How could the War Office, in face of that, refuse to consider their opinion? After all, those officers were practical men; they were the men who commanded the regiments; they were the men who in many instances had led them with success during the war; was it right that their view should be entirely disregarded? They had been met on one point with regard to the question of emolument. His hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Medway Division of Kent, who had also experience as a commanding officer, had told the House of

Commons, as a fact, that the effect of the Bill had already been to discourage enlistment in the Yeomanry of precisely the class of men who rendered the force efficient, and were capable of careful and valuable service. He believed himself that the attitude of the Government was fundamentally connected with finance more than anything else. The original scheme applied to the yeomen saved a good deal of money, and that was sufficient for the immediate purpose. The right hon. Gentleman had said it was impossible to pay to the yeoman more than was paid to the ordinary dragoon, because differentiation of pay was out of the question. The hon. and gallant Member for Cardiff had blown that argument to pieces. He had shown that there was already differentiation of pay in all classes, both of the Auxiliary and of Regular Services. And the hon. Member who supported the scheme had put the matter in a nutshell when he said that the rates proposed by the Government for the Yeomanry meant asking to buy retail at wholesale prices. He thought that was a just and pithy criticism on the part of the hon. Member. But so far from its being the case that differentiation was impossible, the whole scheme of the Government was based on differentiation of pay, and in a very objectionable form. It was a differentiation not merely between the Yeomanry on the one hand and the artillery on the other, but between the ordinary soldiers in a particular grade. The scheme proposed differentiation in a most objectionable and dangerous form, because it produced jealousy between one officer and another in the same regiment. Even from a theoretical point of view he did not think the scheme would hold water. The idea that they could not differentiate between the Yeomanry and the other forces was wholly untenable. That idea was the main basis of the right hon. Gentleman's argument, but he had been obliged to support it upon other grounds. He had stated that it was impossible, under present conditions, to make the Yeomanry effective. The hon. Member for Cardiff had made a direct challenge to the Government on that point and had asked the right hon. Gentleman if he meant that the present condition of the Yeomanry was unsatisfactory. Was that the view of the Government? When the right hon. Gentleman said it was impossible to make them effective, did he mean that the Yeomanry were ineffective and inefficient at the present moment? Considering the manifold difficulties which they had to face he thought they were a very efficient force, and they now numbered 92 per cent. of their establishment. How did the right hon. Gentleman propose to improve them? Owing to the mania for uniformity on the part of the War Office all these forces had to be brought under the same governing authority, and in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman that was an improvement. As a matter of fact it was nothing of the kind, because it was merely a nominal alteration. What was going to be done to increase the efficiency of the Yeomanry? The Secretary of State for War had said the change was necessary in order to have combined training. He would like the right hon. Gentleman to explain how the putting of the Yeomanry under county associations would make it more easy for them to have combined training. Combined training was possible now, and in many cases it was being carried out. There were, however, a large number of cases in which combined training was impossible now, and in regard to which it would remain impossible after the county associations had been established. In agricultural districts where the yeomen had to go to their occupations during a particular season of the year, they would continue under that disability, although perhaps the bulk of them could take their training later in the year. He thought there was a great danger of diminishing both the strength and the effectiveness of the Yeomanry under the new conditions. It was not a question of the payment of 1s. 3d. as against 4s. 6d. He thought the case made out for continuing the pay of the Yeomanry as at present was unanswerable, but there were other questions apart from pay which were very serious, and he knew that it was the unanimous opinion of the officers commanding these regiments that unless the Government consented to extend the concession they had already made the future position of the Yeomanry force would be very precarious indeed.

MAJOR SEELY did not think the Amendment well conceived, because if any force was to be under the county associations the Yeomanry ought to be part of that organisation. At the same time, he sympathised with many of the arguments that had been used with regard to the pay of the Yeomanry force. Having served himself in the Yeomanry for more than eighteen years he had some knowledge of how the proposal was likely to affect that force. The Secretary of State had confused two things; he had confused the services of the Yeomanry in time of war and the services of the Yeomanry in time of peace. The Yeomanry were prepared to serve at cavalry rates of pay in time of war. But in time of peace the yeoman served for fifteen or eighteen days and received, including allowances, anything from £7 to £8 for his services, while the cavalryman served for the whole year and received anything from £20 to £30 for his services. There was no analogy between the two. In many cases, even at the present rate of pay, a yeoman, after paying a man to do his job and getting a horse, returned from his training £2 or £4 out of pocket. Would it not be better in the case of the Yeomanry to say, "We will make up this man's pay by allowance for his horse, his food, and his camp; a consolidated grant shall be given to him to make up the total to as much as he received before"? He sympathised with the view of the Secretary of State that in time of war the payment should be the same to all branches of the force, and he would suggest a way out of the difficulty. The Government ought to pay these men a higher rate in time of peace, otherwise they would not get them to serve at all. Many yeomen he knew were actually out of pocket by serving the State at the present rate of pay. His right hon. friend need have no fear that the Yeomanry would ask for a higher rate of pay in time of war. If they went to war—as many of them did along with himself a few years ago—they would not require a higher rate of pay. During the South African War, owing to some miscalculation as to the strength of the Boer Army, it was announced that the war was practically over, and many members of the Yeomanry, the Militia, and the Volunteer Forces wished to return home, because they were suffering great loss in connection with their businesses and professions. In the case of his own regiment the men were quite willing to serve as long as there was a real war, but they did not want to be kept doing garrison duty. They were offered 5s. a day, but all the men in his squadron signed a document stating that they did not wish to receive a higher rate of pay than their comrades in the field. He did not think that the right hon. Gentleman quite realised how grave a step he was taking in proposing to reduce the pay of these men in time of peace. He had heard many Army debates, and whenever there had been any proposal to reduce the expenditure or decrease the pay of the soldier hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House, and more especially those sitting on the Front Benches, had said, "Remember that one thing you can never do is to reduce the pay of any single man in His Majesty's Forces." He had heard it stated that for the last 200 years there had never been any reduction in the pay of the soldier. That was probably the reason why the cost of the Army kept on increasing. By proposing to reduce the pay of the Yeomanry they were suggesting a thing which had never been done before, and it was being proposed in regard to a force which had admittedly served the country well in the past and had been a success. The Yeomanry did not mind the loss of the money so much, but what they did resent was the idea that having been singled out to suffer a diminution of pay they were open to the suspicion that they were less efficient than the rest of the force. He would like the right hon. Gentleman to state the reasons why he was asking the members of the Territorial Force to accept the same rate of pay as their comrades in the Regular Army. Would it not be better to lay down a daily rate of pay, and to say in the case of the Yeomanry, as had already been said in the case of the Volunteers, that those men's pay would be made up to as much as they received before by allowances for providing a horse and for camp expenses? That was not too much to ask at a time when they were making a great effort to create a Territorial Army. He need hardly say how much he sympathised with the right hon. Gentleman in his desire to create this national Army, but he thought the Government should not reduce the pay of the men who were asked to undertake higher obligations. The Secretary of State for War made a great mistake if he thought the Yeomanry consisted of feather-bed soldiers. They would do anything they were asked to do provided the Government did not put on them the ignominy of being singled out for a reduction of pay. He knew that the right hon. Gentleman did not suggest this reduction on the ground of economy. The noble Lord had said that many of the proposals were dictated by considerations of economy. That was not a bad thing to be governed by, but he found from calculations which he had made that in this matter the cost would be the paltry sum of £12,000 a year. He wished well to the right hon. Gentleman's scheme, and would give it all the support he could. He belonged to a Yeomanry regiment, and he wished to see it thrive and prosper in the service of the State.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said no one could accuse him of want of sympathy with any of His Majesty's Forces. If it were correct to say that no reduction of pay had ever before been made in the House, then his right hon. friend the Secretary for War had a courage which apparently no other responsible Minister had had, because he was making, not only one, but two reductions of pay. If hon. Members would look at the pay which it was proposed to give the Volunteer—the Territorial infantryman—they would see he was to receive during his fifteen days in camp the pay of a private of the Regulars. It was notorious that hitherto a Volunteer private who went into camp for fifteen days got half-a-crown a day.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I have been in camp often, but have never had anything like that.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said there were other corps than that to which the hon. and gallant Member belonged. In this matter the Secretary for War had, at all events, the courage of his opinion. The Member for Shropshire had said that 3s. a day was going to be deducted from the Yeoman's pay under the present proposals. The cost of messing in various Yeomanry regiments differed enormously—from 1s. 6d. to 4s. 6d. a day. If they retained the Yeoman at 1s. 6d., and he had not 4s. 6d. to pay out of the messing allowance, he practically lost nothing by the present arrangement. There was undoubtedly some reduction, but the cost of the Yeomanry to the country at the present moment was based on the most extravagant regiment scale. A great deal of that cost was unnecessary and undesirable. What his right hon. friend proposed to do was to arrange that the Yeoman in the ordinary economical regiment should not lose anything. The noble Lord the Member for Chorley seemed to suggest that the management of the County Associations would be of no practical assistance and might be some hindrance. In every county there would be a County Association, so that where a regiment was recruited from two counties, each Association, having full power to co-operate with the neighbouring Association, would do all that was required within the county area to promote the benefit of the regiment. There would not merely be no overlapping but there would be brought in a fresh power of assistance for raising recruiting, and maintaining a regiment. In future the commanding officer of a Yeomanry regiment would be able to bring the units together, and there would not merely be no overlapping, but there would be brought in under the County Association, a fresh power of assistance for raising, recruiting, and maintaining a regiment. There was one other point. Some hon. Gentlemen opposite had said that if the pay of the Yeomanry was reduced, it would damage recruiting, and extinguish the force. He did not for a moment believe that. Again, it had been said that the Yeomanry came out for a cheap holiday; if that were so, he did not think the House ought to pay an unnecessarily high rate in order to provide the men with a cheap holiday.

*MR. HUNT said he denied that the Yeomanry came out for a cheap holiday. They came out to do their duty to their country; but they did not want to pay a lot of money out of their own pocket in order to serve their country. The present pay was only sufficient to feed them decently, and enable them to live comfortably; but they were not likely to come out and live like ordinary "Tommies." [AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?] Because they were of a different class. One class of Yeomanry was composed of big farmers, and he did not think it was fair to say that they went out for a cheap holiday.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that he did not allege that they did so. He had only quoted the words used by the hon. Member for West Marylebone. He did not know whether the holiday was cheap, but an hon. Member opposite had said that many of the men took away after training from £8 to £10. [OPPOSITION cries of "Oh, oh."]

*MR. HUNT said the hon. Gentleman did not understand the matter at all. There were two sorts of Yeomanry, one composed of people such as gillies, keepers, and small crofters, whom it paid to come out, and the other composed of big farmers, yeomen, and others, such as were found in the Midlands, Yorkshire and elsewhere, who were quite willing to come out and do their duty if it was not going to cost them a lot of money.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) said that the Yeomanry were looking forward to the time when they would take their place alongside the cavalry of the Line in the event of war. They were prepared to go side by side with the Regular cavalry no matter to what part of the world. If the Yeomanry were to be trained only to assist in defending these shores from invasion, the debate was not worth the time spent upon it. If they were to be controlled by the County Associations he was sure that they would not be prepared to go abroad in time of war. They had heard from the Front Bench that the pay of the Yeomanry was to be reduced, and that he considered unwise. The Yeomanry had been built up with some difficulty by those who understood the requirements of the class who joined it, not only in England but in Scotland and Ireland. By the step proposed they would strike a weighty blow at a very valuable branch of the service. It had been argued that the Yeoman would not suffer, but he could not conceive how that could be so if his pay and allowances were reduced. It was a bad sign if such a revolutionary step was taken and an attempt made to tamper with the pay of the men. Another change to which he objected was that the Yeomanry would be given a field day only with Auxiliaries instead of with high-class Regulars. A large number of the Yeomanry under the proposed scheme would not be able to go to the front in time of war; the proposal would take away from that force its recruiting ground, and it would be found difficult in time of national crisis to gather these hardy countrymen together to carry out the class of work they now did. The existing basis of the force was an excellent one and capable of extension. The present scheme had been founded upon the false assumption that a force was needed for guarding our shores. He thought that was an unfortunate expression, because if our shores were attacked there was not a man in the House, old or young, who would not go down straight away to defend them. All they needed if the foe landed would be for each of them to take a rifle and go out and do his duty to his country. What should be in the mind of the right hon. Gentleman was the idea of getting hold of the most capable men who in the event of war could be sent abroad; it was no use looking at the scheme from the Home defence point of view. They had therefore to ask themselves whether they would do better with the new scheme than by leaving the Yeomanry as it was. He had the honour of raising a Yeomanry squadron once and he knew something about recruiting in time of war, and he assured the right hon. Gentleman that it would be better to allow the Yeomanry to go on on the plan which had been laid down with great skill, and perfect themselves. A great blow would be struck at the force if this scheme went through, and although every one of them would do their best to make it a success they could not help deploring the right hon. Gentleman's proposals as to the Yeomanry.

MR. GUEST wished to know whether the position which the Government took up was that the Yeoman would be no loser by the proposed financial rearrangement.

MR. HALDANE said the pay of the Yeomanry would not be more than that of the Cavalry, but the comfort, the maintenance, the upkeep of the Yeomanry would be substantially up to their present standard. Month by month improvements were being made in that respect. They did not expect the Yeomanry to submit to hard conditions; a special allowance would be made to them, but in pay they could not be differently treated from other Cavalry. By the administration of large forces under men of experience and by economy the Yeomanry would be as well off as they were to-day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he wished to press the point a little further. He believed that what the hon. Gentleman desired to convey was that there should be no change in the substantial comfort of the Yeomanry when called out, that they would not be required to make greater sacrifices than at present. He understood that the Yeomanry did not quarrel with the pay if they could be quite certain that their training would be carried out without deprivation of the substantial comforts they had enjoyed hitherto. He understood that, though the right hon. Gentleman could not increase the pay, the conditions of service would be such as would be equivalent to the 5s. 6d. a day.

MR. HALDANE repeated what he had said as to the substantial comfort in which the Yeomanry would serve, though he would not undertake that the cost should be equal to 5s. 6d. a day. There would be the extra sum bringing up the amount to 1s. a day, called camp allowance. With regard to administration the Government designed that the yeoman should be substantially as well off as he was to-day.

MR. GUEST said that, as it was the intention of the right hon. Gentleman that the standard of comfort of the Yeomanry was not to be diminished, that under the new scheme he would have the same class of food and would receive as now the allowance for his horse, £5, he had no difficulty in voting with the Government.

Mr. HALDANE said the horse allowance to which the hon. Gentlemen referred would not necessarily be £5. He had been much struck by the way in which some members of the Yeomanry had three or four horses and hired them out, and he would like to divert some of the £5 allowance to encouraging such a thing as that.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY said the Government were going to provide a scale of luxury in the Yeomanry quarters which would not be allowed in the Infantry quarters of the same camp.

Mr. HALDANE: I must repudiate that suggestion. The standard of comfort we give to one branch of the service will be the standard of comfort all round.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY said it followed that the scale of pay for the Infantry must be increased as well as the scale of pay for the Cavalry.

*Mr. HUNT said that under the new conditions the Yeomanry would be short by 3s. a day. Out of that the right hon. Gentleman could not get.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 89; Noes, 296. (Division List No. 184.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hon. Lt.-Col. A. R
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Macpherson, J. T.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Seddon, J.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Lord Willoughby de Eresby and Mr. Hunt.

## NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithness-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon, S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants,
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan

Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, SirJohn L.(Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow,D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn (Carmart'n)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon.C.H.W. (Hull,W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

And, it being half-past ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 6th May, successively, to put forthwith the Questions on the Amendments moved by the Government, of which notice had been given, and on the Questions necessary to dispose of the Business to be concluded.

Another Amendment proposed—

"In page 2, line 1, after the word 'county,' to insert the words 'or such other person as the Army Council may think fit.'"—(*Mr. Haldane.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 314; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 185.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury,E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,John Emmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt.Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.

Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthy
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Younger, Lord

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Stanley Wilson and Major Anstruther-Gray.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2:—

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 9, to leave out from the word 'Establishing,' to end of line 10, and insert the words 'or assisting cadet battalions and corps and also rifle clubs, provided that no financial assistance shall be given by an association in respect of any person in a battalion or corps in a school in receipt of a Parliamentary grant until such person has attained the age of sixteen.'"—(*Mr. Haldane.*)

Question put, "That the Amendment be made."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 291; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 186.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius

Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R.(Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T.Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar,Arthur(Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, MajorE.Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King,AlfredJohn(Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,EdmundG.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (S. Pancras,E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)

Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, JohnHenry(Halifax)
Whittaker,SirThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,Hon.C.H.W.(Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt.Hn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchest'r
Barrie,H.T.(Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hon. VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Coates,E.Feetham(Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craig,CaptainJames(Down,E.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.
Douglas, Rt Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V.(Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
King,SirHenrySeymour(Hull)
Law,Andrew Bonar(Dulwich)
Lee,ArthurH.(Hants.,Fareham
Lockwood,Rt.Hn. Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson,Wm.G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Rothschild, Hon. LionelWalter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot,Rt.Hn.J.G. (Oxdf Univ.
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col. Sir C.E.Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Henry Craik and Captain Hervey.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Whereupon the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again To-morrow.

## TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES (EXPENSES).

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is expedient to authorise the payment out of money voted by Parliament for Army services of necessary expenditure incurred by associations in pursuance of any Act of the present session to provide for the reorganisation of His Majesty's military forces, and for that purpose to authorise the establishment of County Associations and the raising and maintenance of a Territorial Force and to amend the Acts relating to the Reserve Forces."—(*Mr. Haldane.*)

And, it being after half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 6th May, to put forthwith the Question.

Question put.

The Committtte divided:—Ayes, 294; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 187.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh,
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham).
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts., Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)

Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F (Bury S. Edm'ds.
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seddon, J.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell (Lanark)
Thorne, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

Adjourned at twenty-six minutes after Eleven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

# HOUSE OF LORDS.

*Wednesday, 29th May, 1907.*

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.]. (Petition for additional Provision); Alton Military Hospital. (Petition for Bill); Examiner's Certificates of non-compliance with the Standing Orders referred to the Standing Orders Committee on Monday next.

Wisbech Water Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]. Read 3$^{a}$, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Maidstone Gas Bill. Read 3$^{a}$, with the Amendments, and passed, and returned to the Commons.

Birmingham Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Newquay and District Water Bill [H.L.]. Commons' Amendments considered and agreed to.

Aberdeen Corporation Bill [H.L.] Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1898.

Rules in lieu of Rules 6 (3) and 7 (2), of the Elementary School Teachers Superannuation Rules, 1899.

### NATIONAL DEBT ANNUITIES.

Account of the gross amount of all bank annuities and any annuities for terms of years, transferred, and of all sums of money paid to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, and the gross amount of annuities for lives and for terms of years which have been granted for the same, and contracts for payments on death which have been made within the year ended 5th January, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

## TRANSVAAL REGISTRATION BILL.

Lord AMPTHILL rose to call attention to the action of His Majesty's Government in regard to the Transvaal Registration Bill, and to move for Papers. The noble Lord said: My Lords, my object is to obtain the presentation to Parliament of Papers in continuation of Command Paper No. 3308 entitled "Correspondence relating to legislation affecting Asiatics in the Transvaal." I have no doubt that such Papers will, in due course, and as a matter of course, be laid before Parliament; but I think there is some occasion for rather more expedition than is usual in the publication of official Papers, and at any rate for some statement in anticipation of that publication on the part of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The Blue-book to which I have just referred led up to an important despatch dated 29th November, in which the Secretary of State for the Colonies gave his reasons for declining to proceed further with what is known loosely as the Transvaal Ordinance. The reasons given for this refusal were that the noble Earl found it impossible to regard the proposals embodied in the draft Ordinance as affording an adequate measure of relief from the disabilities to which British Indians were subject in the Transvaal. It was clear to him, said the noble Earl, that they fell far short of the reforms which Her late Majesty's Government repeatedly pressed on the Government of the late South African Republic, and that they did not contain more than an instalment of the measures of relief which had been advocated by his predecessor.

The declaration made in this despatch, which, if I may say so, was couched in weighty and conciliatory, but, at the same time, firm, language, gave rise to a confident hope that the noble Earl would persist in his determination to obtain justice for our Indian fellow-subjects and that he would not relax his endeavours to succeed where his predecessors had failed. Meanwhile self-government was granted to the Transvaal Colony in circumstances with which your Lordships are familiar, and on 20th and 21st March the new Transvaal Legislature passed a Bill practically identical in substance with the rejected Ordinance. Naturally there was much speculation as to the action which would be taken by the noble Earl the Secretary of State for the Colonies and by His Majesty's Government. The next thing we heard was the statement made in another place, on behalf of the noble Earl, to the effect that the Government had decided not to advise His Majesty to disallow the Act, having regard to the fact that it was supported by the unanimous authority of a Parliament newly elected in a self-governing Colony. I venture to think, my Lords, that this reason—the only reason—for a complete reversal of what had hitherto been the policy of His Majesty's Government under both Parties, was entirely inadequate. If it were adequate, what had become of the objections which had been made by the noble Earl and by his predecessors on the score of equity and of justice?

If it is the case that the unanimous authority of the Transvaal Parliament cannot be questioned, what was the object, I should like to ask, of the provision in the Constitution which reserved for the decision of His Majesty's Government any law whereby persons not of European birth or descent may be subjected or made liable to any disabilities or restrictions to which persons of European birth or descent are not also subjected or made liable? Would this reservation also be nugatory in the circumstance, the not absolutely impossible circumstance, of the Transvaal Legislature deciding by a unanimous vote that they would maintain the institution of Chinese indentured labour?

It is necessary to refer to the circumstances in which what is called the unanimous authority of the Transvaal Parliament was given. The Bill was rushed through all its stages in both Houses of the Legislature within a period of twenty-four hours. I need not point out how little discussion there could have been in those circumstances, or how much consideration could have been given to the objections which had been repeatedly and clearly stated on behalf of His Majesty's Government. I will content myself by quoting the words of Mr. Lionel Curtis, who was the Colonial Secretary to the Colony under the previous *régime* and who was himself actually the author of the Ordinance which had been superseded by this Registration Bill. Mr. Curtis, in the debate, said—

> "While supporting the Government in the most welcome action they had taken that day in regard to Asiatics, he also supported the Amendment of Mr. Martin."

The Amendment of Mr. Martin was nothing more than a modest suggestion that the Committee stage should be postponed until the next day, so that the members of the Council might acquaint themselves with the Bill. Mr. Curtis went on to say—

> "If the measure before the House was rushed on the first day of the sitting, and especially without discussion in that Council, they would be putting a most powerful weapon in the hands of the antagonists in England of His Majesty's Government there. This matter was thrown out before, not on principle but on details, and how many members could say that they had familiarised themselves with the Bill? It was as important a measure as any which that or any other Parliament could deal with."

The warning by Mr. Curtis was disregarded, and the Bill was rushed through without discussion and without consideration.

I would ask what possible reason for this urgency can there have been? We have heard nothing to show that there was any sudden emergency or any danger of disturbance. Indeed, what danger of disturbance could there have been from the peaceful, law-abiding, gentle Indian folk who ply their various vocations in the Transvaal? The situation was this. On the one hand there were over 250,000 white men with full political power in their hands and with an open door through which an unlimited accession of their numbers could take place; on the other hand, there were approximately 14,000 British Indians with no power or privileges whatever, and—though it has not been proved—an alleged monthly increase of 100. It would be foreign to my purpose to comment on the general aspects of this trial of strength between the Parliament of the new Colony and His Majesty's Government; but surely the circumstances left it open to His Majesty's Government, without any fear of being considered unreasonable or of meeting with any formidable challenge on the part of the Colonists, to use the power which they had expressly reserved, in order, at least, to impose some condition on their assent to the proposed legislation. But, so far as we know, assent to the Bill was given unconditionally and without any qualifications whatever. At least, it ought to have been made a condition of the assent to the Bill that the regulations under the Bill, in which most of the harshness and injustice is found, should be so revised as to make them less degrading and humiliating.

I dare say the noble Earl will tell me that General Botha, the Premier of the Transvaal, has given assurances that this will be done as far as possible; but, my Lords, the personal assurance of the Premier of the Colony, however much value we may set on it—and I am sure there is nobody who would question the value of an assurance on the part of General Botha—cannot be the same thing as a condition offered by His Majesty's Government and accepted by the Government of the Colony. There are two sides to this question, of course, as there are to every question of importance. I do not ignore the Colonial side of the question, but I do maintain that our side is equally important, and that, therefore, this was a matter for compromise and not for surrender. What reality or what value can there be in our Imperial hegemony if we have to give up rights which we are bound to safeguard on behalf of the Empire as a whole in the face of threats from a section of the community in any part of the Empire?

We all admit in the fullest manner the right of the self-governing Colonies to manage their domestic concerns in their own way; but we cannot admit, nor can the Colonies claim, nor do they claim, that this right includes the liberty to injure any other part of the Empire. But this legislation does injure us. It vitally touches our honour, it renders of no account the pledges, actual and implied, which our statesmen have given to the peoples of India ever since we have ruled over that great Dominion of the Crown. To show your Lordships how we are being discredited in this matter I would like to quote what took place, if the newspaper reports are to be believed, at a recent meeting of the German Colonial Society. A resolution was passed at that meeting threatening British Indians in the German Colonies with differential legislation, and a Deputy of the Reichstag is said to have remarked that the Boers had passed sharp laws against the Indians and the British had taken them over, and that, therefore, there was no reason to fear complications with Great Britain. That shows what other countries are beginning to think of us, and I need not enlarge again on the opinion that will be formed in India of the failure of His Majesty's Government to redeem their pledges.

I have said that there are two sides to this question. The attitude of the colonists in the matter is perfectly intelligible, and I am certainly not going to deny that from their point of view it is reasonable. They claim that the country that they have won with toil and strife should remain their country—a white man's country. We must admit their right to establish that condition of affairs; we must also admit that it is necessary, for the purpose, to restrict Asiatic immigration, and that the restrictions must be effective; but we cannot admit that those measures must be harsh, vindictive, and unjust. Take, for instance, registration, which is the instrument by which this immigration is restricted. Why should it be necessary to insist on a system of finger-print identification, a system which is associated in the minds of every Indian solely with the identification of criminals? There are only a proportion of the Indians in the Transvaal who cannot write. Why should it not be permissible for those who can write to give their signatures as other people do? Or, if a further condition were necessary, why should it not be permissible for them to furnish at their own expense photographs as a means of identification? Then the system of identification by finger-print would merely be confined to those who are illiterate and are unable to comply with the other and more reasonable conditions.

There are other harsh regulations on which I do not intend to dwell, as on the present occasion I am dealing merely with general considerations. But while we are obliged, as reasonable men, to concede that the present condition of South Africa necessitates restrictions to which we must object on principle, we can, at the same time, consistently retain our ideal, and claim that nothing should be done now which would prevent the ultimate realisation of that ideal—that all who are subjects of His Majesty the King should be able to claim under the British flag in any part of the Empire, whatever their race, their colour, or their creed, rights and privileges which they could not claim elsewhere. The citizenship of the British Empire should carry with it something of the prestige which was associated with the proud boast *Civis Romanus sum* under the ancient Empire of Rome. We ought to be able to regard the present restrictions of British citizenship in the Transvaal as a temporary and transient condition of affairs, incidental, inevitably incidental perhaps, to a new country, but which will pass off when the country has been settled and fully developed by those who have the first right, as we admit, to own its resources. But that is not the case at present in view of the recent action of His Majesty's Government.

There is one more point to which I should like to call attention. His Majesty's Government have promised to guarantee a loan of £5,000,000 to the Government of the Transvaal Colony, and it is remarked that a principal condition of that loan is a settlement of the Chinese labour question satisfactory to His Majesty's Government. I would ask, Is it also a condition of that £5,000,000 liability which the taxpayer of this country is to undertake in order to save the honour of a political Party that the British Indian question should be settled in a manner satisfactory to the nation? I trust that the noble Earl will be able to promise the early publication of further correspondence, and that he will meanwhile inform the House of the precise conditions, if any, on which he gave assent to the Transvaal Asiatic Law Amendment Bill. I beg to move.

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for further Papers in regard to the Transvaal Registration Bill."—(*Lord Ampthill.*)

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of ELGIN): My Lords, the noble Lord in reverting to the subject to which he drew your Lordships' attention some little time ago has, I think, still maintained, to a certain degree, the proposition which I then thought scarcely justifiable, namely, that it was necessary to vindicate the right of admission for all subjects of His Majesty, including His Majesty's subjects in India, into any part of the British Dominions. I do not think myself that that can be accepted without limitations.

LORD AMPTHILL: I said as an ideal.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: I quite agree as an ideal. I only wish to put the point that there must be limitations to that ideal, and I was going on to observe that in another part of his observations to-night the noble Lord did accept that position, because, in speaking of the right of self-governing Colonies to legislate, he admitted that circumstances might occur in which it was necessary for the self-governing Colonies to exercise the right of imposing limitations upon other subjects of the Crown or upon aliens entering their possessions. That being so, what we really have to deal with in this question is not the admission of Asiatics, but their fair treatment when they are in the country. With regard to that, I think I said last time that I had always maintained in India, and that I maintained here, that we had a right to claim from the Colonies that they should give fair treatment to those subjects of the Crown of Asiatic birth whom they admit to dwell within their territory.

Then the question is, how is that fair treatment to be secured? Granting, as the noble Earl does, the right of legislation to the self-governing Colonies, it can only proceed by the legislation which the self-governing Colonies adopt. The Ordinance which was before Parliament on the former occasion, and which His Majesty's Government advised that they could not accede to, was an Ordinance adopted by the Crown Colony Government which existed at that time in the Transvaal, and adopted at a very late stage in the existence of that Government. It was known to us that within a very few months that Government was to be changed and a self-governing Administration set up, and as there were certain modifications which, under our responsibilities in Crown Colonies, we would have desired to have insisted upon had the Crown Colony continued, we thought it necessary not to sanction that Ordinance at the time, because it was obvious that there would not be an opportunity for the then existing Government to consider and introduce the modifications which we required.

That was the position, therefore, when the Government changed. But the Government now is the ordinary Government of a self-governing Colony. That Government immediately on meeting passed, I quite admit with very great haste, a Bill which substantially was on the lines of the Ordinance which had been submitted to us. I regret very much that they thought it necessary to take that step; but I do not think it is correct to say that the only reason given for the precipitancy was the unanimous consent of all sections of the white population, though I am bound to say that the unanimous consent of all the representatives of the white population in the Colony is a very material fact. But there was another reason for prompt action, and that was that there was an illicit and unathorised influx of Asiatics into the Transvaal going on, which it was desired to check.

Now, returning to the distinction which I drew at the beginning between the admission of Asiatics and their fair treatment in the Colony after admission, I think I have also a right to claim the assent of the noble Lord when I say that it was not unreasonable that the new Government should wish promptly to obtain powers adequately to check an illicit and unauthorised influx of Asiatics. The noble Lord seemed to think—and of course unless one considers the circumstances it was natural to think—that the fact that the Parliament had just met was a sufficient reason for taking longer time for consideration; but I would remind the House that the Parliament had to adjourn, and was adjourned, immediately, in order that the Prime Minister might attend the Colonial Conference in this country. Therefore, if the powers which were desired were to be obtained for use during these months until Parliament reassembled, the Bill had to be passed in the way in which it was passed.

The position which His Majesty's Government took on this subject was that we were sorry that it was necessary to act in a manner which might be called hasty, but we did recognise the force of the reasons given and to which I have already referred. But in doing so we stated most distinctly in the despatch, which I shall have no objection to lay on the Table, that we adhered to the opinions expressed by successive Secretaries of State as to the desirability of relaxing the restrictions to which Asiatics are at present subject, and that we commended this view to the Transvaal Government in the hope that it might be considered how far practical effect might be given to it. We did not say that without some reason to suppose that that observation would be taken into consideration, because this took place during the time that the Prime Minister of the Transvaal was in this country; and, carrying out a promise which I made to the House on the last occasion, I did take every opportunity I could during the sittings of the Conference to confer with the representatives from the Colonies in regard to this matter.

I should like to point out to the noble Lord, with regard to the fair treatment of Asiatics, that the greater part of the Bill simply enacts that registration should take place. Registration must take place. It is prescribed in the legislation which now exists, but it is not effective. If there is to be restriction at all of an illicit and unauthorised influx, a proper registration must take place. The regulations to which the noble Lord quite justly takes exception in some cases are not laid down in the Bill itself, but under powers in the 18th Section of the Bill. Powers are there given to the Governor in Council from time to time to alter and repeal regulations for certain purposes. Among these are the regulations to which the noble Lord called attention with regard to finger-prints. I am aware that there is a connection in people's minds between finger-prints and criminals, because I think it was during my time in India that the system of using finger-prints for identification of prisoners was very much developed there. But I do not see that making a mark with the thumb instead of with the pen should necessarily have any criminal connection.

There is this further circumstance which I may perhaps mention. I had the honour of receiving a deputation at the time when the former Ordinance was under consideration, and one of the Native gentlemen who came from the Transvaal as a member of that deputation produced a pass which he himself had, and I found in the corner of it a finger-print. I asked him to explain this. An attack was being made on the new Ordinance with regard to the adoption of finger-prints, yet here was a pass under the old Ordinance on which a finger-print was observable. He replied that that was true, but that it was given voluntarily. That was the distinction which he made. I believe there has been a further distinction drawn, that under the regulations as they were proposed not only the thumb but the fingers of the hand were to be imprinted. I only mention this to show that, if you argue the thing out, you come to a variety of distinctions, and this seems to me to diminish the seriousness of the objections to the regulations. However that may be, I do not wish to argue in favour of finger-prints except as being admittedly the easiest and most effective way of registering the identity of persons of deficient education. But, as I say, I had conferences with the representatives of the Colonies, and they made no objection whatever to undertaking to consider fairly and frankly this particular regulation when they went back, and also whether or not photography or some other method could be adopted.

I have only to say, with regard to the Bill, that His Majesty's Government, while there were things that they would have liked to have seen altered in the regulations before the Bill had been passed, while they would have preferred to have seen the Bill longer debated and passed with the deliberation which characterises the proceedings of this House, did not think they would be justified in refusing sanction to this Act, coming as it did with the unanimous assent of the Transvaal representatives.

As I have mentioned the Colonial Conference, I would like to take this opportunity of adding that I did confer, not only with the Prime Minister of the Transvaal, but also with the Prime Ministers and representatives of other Colonies on the whole of this subject. In some cases, as in the case of the Transvaal, those were personal conferences; but in one case, that of Australia and the position of Asiatics in that part of the world, the question did come before the Conference as a whole, at a meeting at which the representative of India was present and upon a point upon which India was particularly interested, the employment of lascars upon ocean-going steamers. In that case the view taken by His Majesty's Government was that they could not admit for a moment that the employment of lascars in these great lines of ocean-going steamers could legitimably be prevented, or that they could concur at any rate in its being prevented, by Colonial legislation. Of course, the Colonial Legislatures have a right to say what ought to be done in their own waters and with regard to their own coasting trade, but for the main trade between Australia and other parts of His Majesty's Dominions we maintained stoutly that the employment of lascars must continue to be permissible. I do not know that I have more to say in regard to this Bill, except to repeat that I am quite willing to give the despatches in connection with it. I think they are only two, but I will take the earliest opportunity of issuing the Papers in which they will be included.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I have never concealed from myself that the noble Earl has had a very difficult problem to deal with in connection with this matter. It is a problem which must be specially embarrassing to him, because he must evidently be drawn both ways, sometimes by his recollection of the country over which he presided as Viceroy with so much distinction, and sometimes by the claims of the Colonies, for whose interests he is now responsible. There can be no doubt that, as he has put it to your Lordships, the dominant fact we have to deal with is that the Transvaal has been given full responsible self-government, and that it would be a negation of that Government to deprive the people of the colony of the full right of, as it has been described, deciding the materials of which the future nation shall be built up.

We know that it is the desire of this particular Colony that it shall be a white man's country, and we can understand their natural wish to prevent anything like an inroad of an alien population. The people of the Transvaal have before them the experience of the Colony of Natal, where the introduction of Asiatics has been freely permitted, and in which, unless I am misinformed, there are something like thirteen non-Europeans to every ten Europeans in the country. Of course, in an inland colony like the Transvaal the difficulty is greater, because it is not easy to prevent the gradual infiltration of Asiatics across a land frontier of considerable extent. I noticed that the noble Earl spoke more than once of what he called an illicit and unauthorised influx of Asiatics, and I take it that he meant by that a surreptitious introduction of Asiatics in opposition to the law or regulation now in force.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: That was the reason which was given for the former Ordinance by the Transvaal Government, and it is repeated now.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Under the present law this influx is illegal?

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: It is said to be illegal, but there is no proper registration to go upon, and the matter is difficult to check.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: Of course, if there is a doubt as to the illegality——

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: I did not mean that there was the slightest doubt on that point.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: In the circumstances it is difficult to see what else the Colonial Government can do, if the introduction of these people is really illegal, except to take such measures as are within their reach to prevent the introduction from proceeding, and at the same time to treat with proper consideration and in an equitable spirit those Asiatics who have already acquired a domicile in the colony, and for whom we are bound, as the noble Earl admits, to secure fair treatment. The question is, does this new law really secure what the noble Earl means by fair treatment? I own that I have a little difficulty in persuading myself that it does, because we have on record the statement of the noble Earl that the Ordinance which His Majesty's Government in the first instance disallowed contained proposals which could not be regarded as affording an adequate measure of relief from the disabilities to which British Indians were subject in the Transvaal, and therefore fell far short of the reforms repeatedly pressed upon the Government of the late South African Republic. Now the noble Earl tells us that the Act which has been passed differs very little from the Ordinance which he denounced in such clear and emphatic language; therefore we certainly cannot congratulate the noble Earl upon having succeeded in obtaining for British Indians what he has himself described as fair treatment. With regard to the system of registration and the use of digital marks, the noble Earl has mentioned his conversation with a gentleman who of his free will allowed his thumb mark to be put upon a document which he carried in his pocket.

*THE EARL OF ELGIN: There was a space for it.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: That is not the same thing as inflicting upon the whole of these people a system of registration by the marks of the ten digits, which these Indians unquestionably connect in their minds with the system of police supervision of the criminal classes. What hope does the noble Earl hold out to us that this state of things will be in any way improved? My noble friend behind me suggested, and I think very fairly, that the occasion was one when the noble Earl, so to speak, held a good many trumps in his hand, and when he might have given his approval to the proposed legislation conditionally upon some of these matters being put straight. The noble Earl has told your Lordships that he could not do this, because the matter was urgent owing to the Asiatics continuing to pour into the Transvaal. I do not think that is a very conclusive reason. Even supposing that a few hundred more of these people had succeeded in crossing the frontier, that is surely a lesser evil than even in appearance to throw over the interests of these Indians, who themselves look to you for protection, and whose fellow countrymen in India are watching what is taking place. The hurry in passing the legislation seemed to me, I must say, indecent. The noble Earl, with a smile on his countenance which he could not conceal, spoke of the

Bill having passed through the Colonial Parliament with more precipitation than is usual in your Lordships' House, but I think he must look to that exceptional activity which this House sometimes displays in the dog days if he wants to find anything like an expedition corresponding to that displayed by the Transvaal Legislature on this particular occasion.

The only gleam of hope which the noble Earl held out was this. He told us the other day that, although in his opinion the matter was not one which he could ask the Conference to deal with, there might be informal conferences on the subject, and he tells us this evening that His Majesty's Government have signified a hope that there may be some improvement in the treatment of the Indians already domiciled. We all remain under the favourable impression left here by the distinguished statesman of the Transvaal who has lately honoured this country by his presence; and I feel sure that if he has given the noble Earl any encouragement to expect that these matters will be reconsidered, such encouragement has not been given in vain. But I frankly own that, looking at the matter as it stands at this moment, the position in which these British Indians have been left does not appear to me to be satisfactory or very creditable to the manner in which their interests have been watched over by the Government of this country.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

## TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION TO SOLDIERS.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I rise to call attention to instructions issued by the War Office on 31st October last to the various military commands with reference to giving technical instruction to soldiers to fit them for civil life; to ask what steps have been taken by commanding officers in accordance with such instructions, what facilities have been given to soldiers to obtain technical instruction, and how far they have availed themselves of such facilities; and to move for Papers.

It may be in the recollection of some of your Lordships that last session I took exception to the action of the Government in not completely following out the recommendations of Sir Edward Ward's Committee on this question. That Committee recommended that the soldier should be given every facility to learn a trade, and also that he should be required to learn a trade. The Government, however, have thrown over the second recommendation, and have only partially adopted the first. In recruiting you have two objects in view—namely, to get the best men you can, and to keep out the bad men. Those objects are mutually dependent. There is no greater obstacle to recruiting than the knowledge on the part of good men that they may possibly be required to associate with undesirable persons, and if undesirable persons are kept out you will not only get better recruits but in the long run more recruits. The best way to keep out undesirables is, in my opinion, to tell the soldier on enlistment that he will be compelled to learn a trade. The Government, however, have done nothing to keep idlers out of the Army, or to secure that when idlers get into the Army they shall be idlers no longer.

In several respects the Government have not only refused to adopt, but have gone absolutely counter to, the recommendations of Sir Edward Ward's Committee. In their circular letter they state that in all cases, whatever trade the soldier takes up, he shall be compelled to pay part of the cost himself. That is not in accordance with the recommendation of Sir Edward Ward's Committee, but absolutely contrary. The Committee recommended—

> "In some of the subjects a portion of the expense should be borne by the men, the instruction and materials being expensive."

That means, of course, that where the materials are not costly and the instruction not very expensive the soldier should be entitled to be taught the trade free. It seems to me that the Government are doing their best to make a dead letter of this important recommendation.

The various agencies which endeavour to obtain employment for ex-soldiers point out that they are confronted not only by the difficulty of the soldier not being trained for civil life, but that they have to face the difficulty that in many cases he is shy of work and refuses to accept any situation where hard work is involved. This state of things is partly due to the demoralising influence of the life of the infantry soldier. On this point I would quote what was said by a gallant officer who spoke with considerable authority on that matter. I refer to General Sir Frederick Fitzwygram, who frequently called attention in the House of Commons to the absolute necessity of giving soldiers instruction which would fit them for civil life; but I am afraid that his efforts in that respect met with as little success as have my own. On 10th June, 1892, General Fitzwygram pointed out that there was no difficulty in recruiting except for the infantry, and that is the case at the present day. In the course of his speech on that occasion—I am quoting from *Hansard*—General Fitzwygram said—

> "Looking at the causes, I think the failure of the infantry lies in the exceedingly idle life which the infantry soldier is compelled to lead during his seven years of service. Beyond an hour or two's drill and a little cleaning he has nothing to do, and therefore it is unreasonable to suppose that such a man would readily take to the hard work which is part of civil life."

And again he said—

> "I look on this question of the employment of infantry soldiers during their period of service as the important element in relation to recruiting. When a man leaves the service to loaf about, he damages that service, and damages, too, the recruiting; but were the infantry soldier fairly well employed during his seven years of service I believe that he would prosper on regaining civil life."

Those are very strong words, and it appears to me that if they are to any extent true, they prove that our system of recruiting is unjust and cruel to the men and most detrimental to the public service. At present the soldier may be as idle as he pleases, and, naturally, when he leaves the Army he is an incapable, and his failure to get work discourages others from enlisting. Everything has been done apparently to prevent recruiting being a success, and then people express astonishment and clamour for conscription. The sort of recruits who go into the Army in order to live an idle life are the bad bargains of the service; they are the men who desert, who malinger, and who keep good men out of the Army. It seems to me that if you were to tell the recruit on joining that he must learn a trade during his term of service you would attract only good men into the Army and men who desired to make the most of their opportunities.

I notice that the Association for the Employment of Discharged Soldiers, which is under the direct patronage of the War Office, pointed out in their last Report that—

> "It was more difficult this year than ever to obtain employment, especially for unskilled men."

The whole of the Report is extremely eloquent on the subject of the old soldier being given preferential employment, but it is absolutely silent with regard to the important question of the industrial training of the soldier while in the Army. I think the soldier is entitled to have preferential employment, but, after all, that is but a surface remedy; it is merely skin plaster, and does not touch the root of the evil, which is that the soldier is not an employable person in civil life. I am very much obliged to the noble Marquess opposite who presided at the meeting of the Association for the Employment of Discharged Soldiers at which the Report from which I have quoted was presented, for what he said on that occasion. I think he was the only speaker at the meeting who called attention to the necessity that the soldier should be given some instruction that would be of use to him in civil life.

I wish to call attention very briefly to the Report on Recruiting, and to quote one sentence which seems to me of the utmost importance. At the end of his yearly Report the Director of Recruiting says—

> "Several districts, in their annual Reports, have stated that if the recommendations of the Ward Committee were carried out the recruiting problem would be solved, and there is no doubt whatever that the adoption of the recommendations would go a considerable distance towards the solution."

I would ask the noble Earl whether it might not be possible to publish some, at all events, of the district Reports on recruiting, so that we might know what the view is in the district commands with regard to the recommendations of the Ward Committee. I wish to know whether the circular letter issued by the War Office has produced any result at all. My information is that it has produced none, and that it is absolutely a dead letter.

The noble Earl will find it suggested in the War Office Circular, at the top of page 2, that the preliminary arrangements would best be carried out by a committee of officers interested in technical instruction, who would not only suggest methods of instruction but get into touch with the technical institutes in the towns in which soldiers are quartered. I wish to know if anything has been done in that direction. It is said that commanding officers are as a rule hostile to the system of training soldiers for employment. The noble Earl opposite, Lord Donoughmore, when he was Under-Secretary of State for War, said, in speaking on this question, that the British officer was an old-world Tory, compared to whose toryism the toryism of noble Lords opposite was as moonlight is to sunlight or as water is to wine. His suggestion was that British officers were such absolutely immovable Tories that they would not look at any new idea at all. I confess I have better hopes of commanding officers than the noble Earl opposite. I hope that, even though they may think it is time wasted, they will defer to superior authority and do their best to carry into effect the recommendations of Sir Edward Ward's Committee. If they do they will add enormously to the great debt of gratitude they have already earned at the hands of their countrymen. To turn the Army into an excellent school for civil life is, I think, the most important military reform that has ever come before the country, and I do hope that the Government will stiffen their backs and insist that every recommendation of the Ward Committee should be carried into effect. I beg to move for Papers.

Moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Majesty for Papers relating to the answers received to the circular issued by the War Office on the 31st October last, to the various military commands with reference to giving technical instruction to soldiers to fit them for civil life."—(*Lord Monkswell.*)

*THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (The Earl of PORTSMOUTH): My Lords, my noble friend has covered a large amount of ground, and I hope he will not consider that I am in any way wanting in sympathy with many of the views he has expressed if I feel bound to confine myself, more or less, to the actual points contained in the Question on the Paper. I think that perhaps the most straightforward and best course I could adopt would be to state as briefly as I can exactly what has taken place since the noble Lord brought the question forward in November of last year, and I laid on the Table a circular letter dated 31st October, which was issued by the War Office to the various commands at home and abroad.

We have received at the War Office a great number of replies in response to that circular. I do not propose to lay upon the Table the whole of the official literature which has accumulated; some of it is of a partly confidential character, and some of it is too detailed, but I have had a careful *précis* made which I propose to lay on the Table of the House in reply to my noble friend's Motion. In that *précis* all the salient points in the replies will be clearly set out. From it your Lordships will see what steps the general officers commanding in each of the eight large commands have taken to comply with the instructions contained in the circular letter. Considerable difficulties have been presented, and I think I ought in fairness to state that the commanding officers lay great stress on the very discouraging attitude in regard to this matter which has been taken up by some of the trade unions. If I remember aright, my noble friend gave us to understand, in the autumn of last year, that the trade unions would not feel themselves aggrieved in this matter, and that their jealousies would not be aroused. Your Lordships will see in the *précis* which I propose to lay that several of the general officers commanding state most clearly that in this matter we have to overcome, to put the matter in a very mild form, a considerable amount of opposition on the part of the trade unions. Lord Grenfell, writing from Ireland, states—

> "All the large firms approached say that the trade unions make it impossible for them to offer facilities for training without Government intervention."

And the General Officer Commanding the Eastern command, Lord Methuen, says that—

> "The trade union system, as at present regulated, seems fatal to the success of soldiers in skilled trades."

The General Officer Commanding in Scotland writes—

> "There is little doubt that the trade unions would take prompt measures to prevent ex-soldiers from getting employment to the

detriment of men who have passed through the mill."

The question from the industrial point of view is not such a simple and easy one as some of your Lordships might have supposed; and I confess to a little disappointment that we have not been able to make more progress in this matter.

In the *précis* the possibilities of civil and military employment are enumerated. Suggestions are made as to which trades are best suited to local requirements, several additional trades being added to those mentioned in the circular. All the Reports made have been considered by the Advisory Committee. Two circular letters have been issued dealing with the value of civil technical schools and with the great possibilities of instruction in agriculture and telegraphy. These I also propose to lay. Last year we were allotted £1,000 for training, the principal part of which has been spent on new motor-cars, motor driving commending itself as an occupation to many of the men. Certain sums were provided for general capital expenditure in workshops. This year a much larger sum has been placed on the Estimates than last year, the amount having been raised to £2,500. I hope this is some indication that we are not neglecting this matter.

The question of compelling men to learn a trade as a condition of joining the Army is a very large one, and I am not entitled to express an opinion on the subject without much more thorough knowledge than I now possess. It will be necessary to hear the opinions of those who are experienced in recruiting. A Committee at the War Office, of which I was Chairman, has been considering the question of the Army schools. The principal reason why we have to maintain these schools is that it is necessary to educate adult soldiers, a large proportion coming from the country with which my noble friend opposite (Lord Donoughmore) is connected, and where they do not enjoy such efficient elementary education as exists in England and Scotland. Evidence was given before the Committee that the great difficulty was that, though a large number of these men joined the adult classes, after a time they "tailed off" and ceased to attend. That, I am sorry to say, is what we were told by those personally acquainted with the matter in regard to these classes of technical instruction.

We have already asked the general officers commanding for suggestions regarding the distribution of the £2,500 provided in the present year's Estimates. We shall keep in touch through our Standing Committee at headquarters with the local committees, and with the Automobile Club, or any other associations that may be of assistance, and in conjunction with the general officers commanding, we hope to co-ordinate central and local efforts. It is not quite fair to imply that some general officers show a want of interest, or adopt almost an obstructive policy as regards the question of technical instruction. I do not think we have any evidence of that. I feel that this is a matter in which we have to proceed extremely tentatively. Our Army is a voluntary Army, and, however much one may wish that the soldiers would undertake certain additional duties, it is necessary to consider very carefully a step which they may regard as a restriction of their personal liberty. I shall be glad to lay Papers on the Table.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: My Lords, I cannot refrain from rising to the fly that was thrown by the noble Earl who has just sat down, being naturally stung by his suggestion to the effect that the Army schools have to be kept up because the recruits from Ireland are so illiterate.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I did not say all, but a large proportion.

THE EARL OF DONOUGHMORE: If I may judge by what I saw when at the War Office, the English and Scottish recruits were just as illiterate as the Irish recruits. The boy who had been four or five years away from school had generally forgotten even how to read and write, and Irish recruits were not peculiar in the matter. No doubt the system of education in Ireland is not all it ought to be, but it is better than it would be if a certain Bill now before the other House were passed into law. I think the noble Lord who initiated this discussion, and to whom we are indebted for the persistence with which he raises the question, may content himself that we have advanced a step this evening. I do not propose to offer any further remarks before I have had an opportunity of reading the document which is to be laid on the Table, and from which I anticipate we shall derive some interesting reading. I hope my noble friend Lord Monkswell will keep his eye on that document, and return to the charge later in the session.

LORD MONKSWELL: My Lords, I agree with the noble Earl that we have got a step further. The sum included in this year's Estimates—£2,500—is not large, but it is certainly an advance on the amount previously provided. The War Office circular contemplated that there should be an advisory committee in every district, but up to the present that had not been done. The noble Earl said he was not prepared to express any opinion on the question of compulsion. I would point out that Sir Edward Ward's Committee did give a very decided opinion on that subject, and if you do not go in for compulsion you are not carrying out the most important recommendation of the Committee. The experiment at Woolwich which was cited on a former occasion as showing that the men would not learn a trade, I found on inquiry had been carried out in such a way that success was impossible. The classes were absolutely unfitted for the soldier, and no trouble was taken to see that the soldier could attend the classes. The noble Earl the Under-Secretary brought forward another point which I answered in November last. It is not the fact that trade unions object to this teaching. I went to the fountain-head in regard to that matter and saw Mr. Crooks, M.P., who stated that what they objected to was giving the soldier preferential employment. But, notwithstanding this, commanding officers continue to press for preferential treatment. There may be trade unions that are foolish enough to object, but I am certain that if the question was properly put to the working classes they would be very glad that their fellow-citizens who enlist in the Army should be taught a trade.

On Question, Motion agreed to, and ordered accordingly.

---

## MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATION BILL [H.L.].

The Lord Bishop of Bristol added to the Select Committee.

*The Earl of Donoughmore.*

## TURKEY AND MACEDONIA.

On the Motion for the adjournment of the House,

LORD NEWTON said: Before the House adjourns I beg to ask the noble Lord the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he intends to lay any Papers on the Table relating to South-Eastern Europe.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Lord FITZMAURICE): My Lords, I received a similar inquiry from the Bishop of Hereford, who very kindly, at my request, put off the Motion, which he was about to hand in, to call attention to the condition of Macedonia. My noble friend Lord Newton has asked me practically the same Question. I am now able to say that I hope, not later than the end of next week, to lay three Blue-books before your Lordships dealing with (i.) the general situation in Macedonia during 1906; (ii.) the negotiations relating to the increase in the Turkish Customs duties from 8 to 11 per cent.; and (iii.) the results so far achieved by the Macedonian Financial Commission.

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

---

# HOUSE OF COMMONS.

*Wednesday, 29th May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

---

## *NEW WRITS.*

New Writs, for County of Rutland, in the room of the right hon. George Henry Finch, deceased.

County of Middlesex (Hornsey Division) Captain Charles Barrington Balfour (Manor of Northstead).—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

---

## *PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.*

### PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

MR. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of

Petitions for Private Bills; That, in the case of the Petition for the following Bill, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz:—Alton Military Hospital Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Great Central Railway Bill (King's Consent signified). Bill read the third time, and passed.

Armagh Urban District Council Bill. As amended, considered. To be read the third time.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. Read a second time, and committed.

---

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Amendments to—Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]; Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]; West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An act for rendering valid certain Letters Patent granted to Richard Harrison for an invention for improvements in or connected with elastic wheels applicable to motor and other vehicles." [Harrison's Patent Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, to issue Insurance Coupons; and for other purposes." [General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the time limited by the Heywood and Middleton Water Board Act, 1901, for the construction of waterworks, to confer further powers upon the Heywood and Middleton Water Board with respect to their water undertaking; and for other purposes." [Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords.]

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Pontypridd Urban District Council in regard to the appropriation and use of lands, to make further provision in regard to their gas undertaking; and for other purposes." [Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the North British Railway Company to construct a new dock, a railway, and other works at Methil, to confer further powers on the North British Railway Company with reference to their undertaking and upon that company, the Caledonian Railway Company, and the Lanarkshire and Dumbartonshire Railway Company with reference to undertakings in which those companies are interested, to authorise the Burntisland Harbour Commissioners to lease lands for graving dock; and for other purposes." [North British Railway Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers on the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Coventry in relation to their water undertaking; to authorise the supply to them of water by the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Birmingham; to extend the area of supply under the Coventry Electric Lighting Order, 1891; and for other purposes." [Coventry Corporation Water Bill [Lords], now Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer additional powers upon the Midland Railway Company and upon that Company and the Great Western Railway Company and upon the South Yorkshire Joint Line Committee and upon the Cheshire Lines Committee for the construction of works and the acquisition of lands; to make provision for transferring the Limavady and Dungiven Railway to the Midland Railway Company and to confer powers upon that Company and the Great Central and Hull and Barnsley Railway Companies with respect to certain authorised railways of the Great Central and Hull and Barnsley Railway Companies; and for other purposes." [Midland Railway Bill [Lords.]

Harrison's Patent Bill [Lords]; General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation, Limited, Bill [Lords]; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords]; Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill [Lords]; North British Railway Bill

[Lords]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [Lords], now Coventry Corporation Bill [Lords]; Midland Railway Bill [Lords]; read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

## *PETITIONS.*

### CONGO FREE STATE.

Petition from Muswell Hill, for protection of the Native Races; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions for alteration; from Forres; Leith; and, Stornaway; to lie upon the Table.

### EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petitions against; from Royton; Stratford-on-Avon; and, Wigan; to lie upon the Table.

### LICENSED PREMISES (EXCLUSION OF CHILDREN).

Three Petitions from Chepping Wycombe, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

### LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Hampstead; London; and, Paisley; to lie upon the Table.

### MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against; from Cramlington; Hitcham; Norwich; Plympton; and Shireoaks; to lie upon the Table.

### PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Keighley, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from Leicester, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

### WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.

Petition from Tooting, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

## *RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.*

### NATIONAL DEBT ANNUITIES.

Account presented, of the Gross Amount of all Bank Annuities and any Annuities for terms of years transferred, and of all sums of money paid to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, and the Gross Amount of Annuities for Lives and for terms of years, &c., granted within the year ended 5th January, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 166.]

### ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION RULES.

Copy presented, of Rules in lieu of Rules 6 (3) and 7 (2) of the Elementary Schools Teachers' Superannuation Rules, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

### COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.

Copy presented, of Minutes of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.

Copy presented, of Papers laid before the Colonial Conference, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

### ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS.

Order [15th May] for presenting an Address for a Return relative thereto, read, and discharged; and instead thereof:—East India (Plague),—Address for "Return of the Memorandum of the Royal College of Physicians, in July, 1905, on Plague."—(*Dr. Rutherford.*)

### ENGLISH GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS (POWERS IN IRELAND).

Return ordered, "giving the names of Government Departments or Authorities in England which now exercise powers in or in relation to Ireland, either directly or indirectly."—(*Captain Craig.*)

### LOCAL AUTHORITIES IN SCOTLAND (TECHNICAL EDUCATION).

Return ordered, "showing the extent to which, and the manner in which, local authorities in Scotland have allocated and applied funds to the purposes of Technical Education during the year ending the 15th day of May, 1907, under the following Acts: The Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890; The

Education and Local Taxation Account (Scotland) Act, 1892; The Technical Schools (Scotland) Act, 1887; The Technical Instruction Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1892; and Public Libraries Acts."—(*Mr. Sinclair.*)

## *QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.*

### Maintenance of Roads altered in Connection with Railways.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if it is within the province of the Local Government Board, or of any auditor or inspector of that Board, to ascertain whether local road authorities receive the full amounts due to them from railway companies for the maintenance of all the portions of roads altered in connection with the railways; have those amounts been revised or their accuracy tested since the introduction of local government; and will the Board assist any local road authority so desiring to test and revise these amounts.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) There is no constant rule as to the liability of railway companies for the maintenance of portions of roads affected by the construction of railways, such liabilities, where they exist, being generally prescribed in the private Acts of the companies concerned. The auditors of the Local Government Board are, consequently, to a large extent dependent on the information supplied to them by the local authorities and their officers, on whom devolves the responsibility of obtaining from the companies their proper contributions. It is, however, the practice of the auditors to secure, so far as the facts within their knowledge enable them to do so, that all moneys receivable by the local authorities are duly recovered and brought into account. The auditors have drawn attention to such cases on various occasions both before and since the passing of the Local Government Act.

### Post Office Estimates—Depreciation of Buildings, etc.

MR. WALROND (Devonshire, Tiverton): To ask the Postmaster-General whether any allowance is made in the annual Post Office Estimates for depreciation in the value of the buildings and properties belonging to the Post Office, and interest on and redemption of loans spent on capital account; and if he can state what these would amount to at the usual rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) No allowance is made in the annual Post Office Estimates for depreciation in the value of Post Office buildings and properties. The expense both of erection and maintenance is borne on the Vote for Revenue Buildings, etc., Class 1, Votes 8 and 14. At the present time the only expenditure of the Post Office out of loan capital is that for the telephone system, which is repaid under Sub-head R 7 of the Post Office Vote. The sum voted under that sub-head includes interest on as well as repayment of capital, as shown in House of Commons Paper No. 369, of last session.

### Close Time for Salmon in the Blackwater.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has seen a copy of a resolution passed at a meeting of riparian owners and anglers held at Kanturk on 25th March last, in which attention was called to the decline in the quantity of salmon in the upper reaches of the Blackwater, and suggesting that the weekly close time should be extended to cover from 6 o'clock a.m. on Friday to 6 o'clock a.m. on Monday, and the annual close season from 1st October to 1st March; and whether, in view of the decline of this industry, the Department of Agriculture will order their fishery inspectors to hold an inquiry at an early date.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The attention of the Department of Agriculture has not been directed to the resolution referred to. The only complaint relating to a shortage of fish in the river Blackwater has come from an English gentleman who rented a fishing at Kanturk and found it unsatisfactory; and the Department do not think that this would justify the holding of a public inquiry. The changes of weekly and annual close times suggested cannot be dealt with without legislation.

### Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of John O'Regan.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the case of John O'Regan, an evicted tenant, Carrignavar, Cork County, has been brought under the notice of the Estates Commissioners; if any inquiry has been made into the circumstances; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into the application for reinstatement lodged by John O'Regan, and will consider his case in connection with a scheme for the distribution of untenanted land on an estate for which negotiations for purchase by the Commissioners are pending.

### Infant Mortality.

MR. RIDSDALE (Brighton): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can give the figures of infant mortality for each year since 1900 in the boroughs of Battersea, Lambeth, Woolwich, Bradford, Burnley, Ashton-under-Lyne, and Dukinfield, and since 1897 for the boroughs of Liverpool and St. Helens.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The following table gives the particulars desired:—

| Name of Borough. | Year. | Deaths of Infants. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number. | Per thousand births. |
| Battersea - - - - - - | 1900 | 826 | 157 |
| | 1901 | 828 | 164 |
| | 1902 | 654 | 135 |
| | 1903 | 688 | 138 |
| | 1904 | 706 | 146 |
| | 1905 | 550 | 114 |
| | 1906 | 588 | 126 |
| Lambeth - - - - - - | 1900 | 1,350 | 147 |
| | 1901 | 1,294 | 142 |
| | 1902 | 1,215 | 134 |
| | 1903 | 1,194 | 132 |
| | 1904 | 1,328 | 147 |
| | 1905 | 1,127 | 128 |
| | 1906 | 1,086 | 131 |
| Woolwich - - - - | 1900 | 469 | 142 |
| | 1901 | 455 | 128 |
| | 1902 | 462 | 124 |

| Name of Borough. | Year. | Deaths of Infants. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number. | Per thousand births. |
| Woolwich—*continued.* | | | |
| | 1903 | 390 | 106 |
| | 1904 | 466 | 132 |
| | 1905 | 364 | 103 |
| | 1906 | 388 | 109 |
| Bradford - - - - - - | 1900 | 945 | 141 |
| | 1901 | 1,085 | 168 |
| | 1902 | 911 | 139 |
| | 1903 | 974 | 148 |
| | 1904 | 1,048 | 167 |
| | 1905 | 873 | 144 |
| | 1906 | 904 | 152 |
| Burnley - - - - - - | 1900 | 611 | 209 |
| | 1901 | 609 | 227 |
| | 1902 | 511 | 176 |
| | 1903 | 586 | 216 |
| | 1904 | 625 | 233 |
| | 1905 | 465 | 174 |
| | 1906 | 612 | 215 |
| Ashton-under-Lyne - - - | 1900 | 225 | 182 |
| | 1901 | 201 | 182 |
| | 1902 | 179 | 146 |
| | 1903 | 238 | 205 |
| | 1904 | 207 | 172 |
| | 1905 | 212 | 179 |
| | 1906 | 183 | 153 |

| Name of Borough. | Year. | Deaths of Infants. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number. | Per thousand births. |
| Dukinfield | 1900 | 138 | 238 |
| | 1901 | 135 | 275 |
| | 1902 | 100 | 182 |
| | 1903 | 103 | 188 |
| | 1904 | 96 | 198 |
| | 1905 | 91 | 196 |
| | 1906 | 91 | 176 |
| Liverpool | 1897 | 4,488 | 201 |
| | 1898 | 4,111 | 184 |
| | 1899 | 4,481 | 199 |
| | 1900 | 4,247 | 186 |
| | 1901 | 4,138 | 188 |
| | 1902 | 3,936 | 162 |
| | 1903 | 3,815 | 159 |
| | 1904 | 4,780 | 196 |
| | 1905 | 3,762 | 154 |
| | 1906 | 4,145 | 172 |
| St. Helens | 1897 | 578 | 181 |
| | 1898 | 566 | 172 |
| | 1899 | 492 | 157 |
| | 1900 | 584 | 188 |
| | 1901 | 550 | 175 |
| | 1902 | 541 | 167 |
| | 1903 | 475 | 138 |
| | 1904 | 578 | 174 |
| | 1905 | 430 | 132 |
| | 1906 | 489 | 158 |

### Visit of Lords of the Admiralty to Portsmouth Dockyard.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is in a position to state when their Lordships will visit Portsmouth Dockyard to hear the petitions of the workmen.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) The visit will take place some time this summer, but the pressure of public business makes it impossible to fix a date long in advance.

### Pay of Civil Service Pensions to Residents Abroad.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state what are the Treasury regulations respecting payment of pension to a superannuated Civil Servant who leaves this country for residence abroad.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Persons in receipt of pensions from the Vote for Superannuation, etc., who emigrate to the Colonies are paid in the following ways:—1. By means of forms payable at the Paymaster General's office, which are negotiable through any bank at home or abroad. 2. By means of powers of attorney. 3. By the officer in charge of the Treasury Chest, when there is a Treasury Chest station in the Colony. 4. Through the Colonial Treasurers of the self-governing Colonies, or other officer appointed by the Colony, where no Imperial paying officer is stationed, a charge of three per cent. being made by the Colonial authorities, which is borne by the pensioner.

### Berkhamsted Grammar School.

MR. WALROND: To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether he is aware that the Board of Education, by a scheme as to Berkhamsted Grammar School, sealed on 13th May, 1907, withdrew from the residents of Berkhamsted the rights reserved to them by the scheme of 8th January, 1903, and even withdrew from the ratepayers who have resided for seven years in Berkhamsted or Northchurch the rights expressly preserved to them by the draft scheme as published by the Board in December, 1905, without any notice of such alteration of the draft; and whether, seeing that the effect of such alteration is to deprive the inhabitants of the last remnant of that right to free education which, for over 300 years, formed a fundamental part of the constitution of this school, and that the Board claim the right to make such an alteration without notice, as if it were a mere modification of the draft, and without communicating the alteration proposed to the councils of the rural parishes affected, he will give his sanction to an appeal to the Court of Chancery, under Section 8 of The Charitable Trusts Act, 1860, from the said Order of 13th March, 1907, in order that the Court may grant such relief as the case may require.

(*Answered by Sir John Walton.*) I have no information as to the terms of the scheme or the circumstances in which it has been settled or published. If an application, complying with the usual practice, is made to me for my authority to appeal, I will consider the application and deal with it.

### Land Revenue of India.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the total amount of the land revenue for the whole of India, excluding Upper Burmah, in the years 1856, 1875, 1895, and 1905; and if he will also state the total land revenue of the Madras Presidency, the Bombay Presidency, the Central Provinces, the North Western Provinces, and the Punjab for the same years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*)

**Land Revenue, Gross Receipts.**

| | 1855-6. | 1875-6. | 1895-6. | 1905-6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | £ | £ | £ | £ |
| India (excluding Burma) | 11,089,558 | 13,786,725 | 15,810,634 | 16,309,866 |
| Madras - - - - | 2,428,167 | 3,030,009 | 3,339,706 | 3,521,140 |
| Bombay (including Sindh and Satara) - - | 1,897,149 | 2,460,236 | 3,251,209 | 2,816,228 |
| North Western Provinces and Oudh (latterly United Provinces of Agra and Oudh) - | 3,474,237 | 3,768,784 | 4,011,296 | 3,926,014 |
| Punjab - - - - | 636,229 | 1,334,078† | 1,597,800 | 1,604,609‡ |
| Central Provinces* - | 280,965 | 405,257 | 511,555 | 572,462§ |

* Entered in the Accounts for 1855-6 as the Nagpore Territory.

† Including the Delhi Territory, which was transferred from the North Western Provinces to the Punjab in 1858.

‡ Including the North West Frontier Province.

§ Excluding Berar.

NOTE. -The Accounts do not distinguish the figures of the revenue in Upper Burma. The land revenue for the whole Province of Burma has therefore been excluded from the totals given. The figures are expressed in pounds sterling, and represent the total land revenue collected in rupees and converted at the rate of fifteen rupees to £1.

### Army Expenditure in India.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: To ask the Secretary of State for India what was the total expenditure on the Army in India in 1870, 1880, 1890, 1900, and 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The desired particulars are as follows:—

| | £ |
|---|---|
| 1870-71 - - - - - | 11,917,000 |
| 1880-81 - - - - - | 16,996,000 |
| 1890-91 - - - - - | 14,914,000 |
| 1900-01 - - - - - | 15,020,000 |
| 1906-07 (revised estimate) - | 19,934,000 |

### Land Revenue of Rawal Pindi District.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: To ask the Secretary of State for India what was the land revenue of the Rawal Pindi district of the Punjab in 1861, 1881, 1901, and according to the new settlement just concluded.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The first regular settlement was not made until 1865. Before that date varying annual settlements were in force. The first year for which figures are available is 1864. It is accordingly shown in the statement below. The assessment made in the regular settlement of 1865 was in force until 1884. The assessment of the second regular settlement continued till 1904—

| 1864.<br>Summary Settlement. | 1881.<br>First Regular Settlement. | 1901.<br>Second Regular Settlement. | New Settlement. |
|---|---|---|---|
| £29,800 | £27,500 | £36,400 | £45,000 |

The figures throughout are for the district as now constituted. Rupees have been converted in sterling at the rate of fifteen to £1.

**Net Revenue from Irrigation in India.**

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL: To ask the Secretary of State for India what was the total net revenue derived from irrigation in India, after paying all charges of maintenance, in 1881–2, 1901–2, and in 1906–7; and what was the total capital invested in irrigation works in 1906.

*(Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.)* The revenue derived from irrigation, as shown in the accounts of the Government of India, the charges for working expenses and maintenance and for interest, and the net result for the three years mentioned, are given in the following statement:—

| | 1881–2. | 1901-2. | 1906 7.<br>(Revised Estimate.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Major works: | £ | £ | £ |
| Receipts, including portion of land revenue credited to irrigation - - - | 899,000 | 2,373,000 | 3,344,000 |
| Working expenses and maintenance - - - | 304,000 | 702,000 | 950,000 |
| Interest - - - - | 534,000 | 944,000 | 1,078,000 |
| Net revenue - - - | 61,000 | 727,000 | 1,316,000 |
| Minor works and navigation: | | | |
| Receipts - : - - | 87,000 | 165,000 | 187,000 |
| Charges - - - - | 527,000 | 719,000 | 905,000 |
| Net expenditure - - | 440,000 | 554,000 | 718,000 |

| | 1881–2.<br>Net Expenditure. | 1901–2.<br>Net Revenue. | 1906–7.<br>Net Revenue. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Net result - - - - | £<br>379,000 | £<br>173,000 | £<br>598,000 |

The capital outlay on irrigation works to the 31st March, 1906, was £31,429,000.

### Pay and Allowances of Military Officers in Bombay Political Service.

Sir SEYMOUR KING (Hull, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will grant a Return showing the present pay and allowances of military officers in the Bombay Political Service as compared with the pay and allowances of military officers of the same length of service in the general cadre of the Indian Political Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The information is already to be found in the Bombay Civil List and the Quarterly Civil List of the Foreign Department, both of which are published. But I have no objection to giving a Return. Perhaps the hon. Member will communicate with me as to the form it should take.

### Pay of Woolwich Arsenal Labourers.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Arsenal labourers who have been put on short time, owing to the suspension of work on Saturdays, are being paid less than the minimum weekly wage of 23s. laid down in the Ordnance Factory rules; and, if so, will it be possible, in consideration of the hardships thereby entailed, to grant them the recognised minimum.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I would refer the hon. and gallant Member to the Answer I gave to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for Woolwich on the 16th instant.†

## *QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.*

### Kilcreggan Fort, Dumbartonshire.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War at what date the land for the fort at Kilcreggan, Dumbartonshire, was purchased; from whom it was bought; the rental derived from the land prior to purchase; the acreage and gross amount paid for it; the conditions of sale as to minerals; and whether the Government were permitted to quarry for stone for the works without any further payment.

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. Haldane, Haddington): The purchase of the land referred to was concluded in October, 1901; it was bought from the Duke of Argyll; the rental previously derived is not known but its prospective value for building affected its cost; its extent is about fifty-two acres of foreshore; the price was £14,500 which included the Duke's rights to minerals and building stone.

### Soldiers' Pensions.

Sir GEORGE SCOTT ROBERTSON (Bradford, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that there are many aged soldiers of excellent character and good record in extreme poverty; and if he will consider the desirability of granting such ancient servants of the Crown, when not in the workhouse, a pension after sixty-five, even if they are not in possession of a medal.

Mr. HALDANE: The grant of pensions to old soldiers merely on the ground of age and circumstances and without regard to service would involve a large expenditure, and a wholly new principle. There are other classes in the community not less interested in the question than soldiers.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman communicate with the Patriotic Fund Commission and ascertain if they have not large resources which may be available for this purpose?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Territorial Army Officers and Commissions in the Regular Army.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether officers of the Territorial Army will be allowed the same privilege of competing for commissions in the Regular Army that is now extended to officers of the Milita.

Mr. HALDANE: The Answer is in the affirmative, subject to conditions similar to those at present applicable to candidates from the Militia and Yeomanry.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE asked what proportion of officers would have this privilege.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiv., 1091.

MR. HALDANE said he must have notice of that Question.

### Public Accounts Committee.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will refer the Statement of Requirements, Cd. Paper 3370, to the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. HALDANE: The Paper in question contains suggestions and explanations with regard to the proposed financial arrangements of the Territorial Forces Bill at present under consideration of the House. It would not, therefore, appear to be a Paper which should be referred to the Public Accounts Committee.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH: Will it, before being finally approved, be submitted to the Committee?

MR. HALDANE: I do not think that is the usual practice.

### Indian Cantonment Act.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will suggest to the Government of India the expediency of amending the Cantonment Act of 1899, so as to admit of private house property within cantonments being placed under the control of civil officers.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs): The existence of the troops being the object of the cantonment, it is essential that the military authority should have complete control over the general arrangements, and not least over all house property within the cantonment area. The powers given to the magistrate who represents the civil power provide sufficiently for its intervention when necessary, and I am not prepared to suggest the amendment of the Cantonment Act of 1899 in the manner suggested.

### Cutch Railway.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence with the Government of India in regard to the proposed construction of a railway through the territory of the Rao of Cutch.

MR. MORLEY: There is no recent correspondence with the Government of India on the subject of the construction of a railway through the territory of the Rao of Cutch, or by the alternative route of which a reconnaissance was undertaken last year. When a despatch has been received from the Government of India, and has been dealt with, I will consider whether the correspondence can be laid upon the Table of the House.

### Lucknow Cantonment Magistrates.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, if he will take such steps as may be necessary to debar cantonment magistrates at Lucknow from trying cases instituted in their capacity as secretaries of cantonment committees.

MR. MORLEY: The organisation of cantonments in India places the executive authority in the hands of a cantonment magistrate, who is also secretary to a cantonment committee of which the commanding officer of the cantonment is the chairman. There is no possibility as the law stands of transferring the hearing of cases within cantonments to other officers than cantonment magistrates, nor would such a transfer be consistent with the system of prompt and strict military administration which necessarily prevails in an area occupied by troops.

### Punjab Land Colonisation Bill.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of the Punjab Land Colonisation Bill as originally presented to the Punjab Legislative Council, and of the Act as finally passed, together with the official Reports of the debates in Council relating thereto.

MR. MORLEY: I have not yet received from India the Bill as finally passed. But I shall be happy to lay on the Table the Bill as introduced, the Select Committee's Report and Amended Bill, and the report of the debates in the Council, if the hon. Member will move for them.

### British-Indian Subjects in German Colonies.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the recent proceedings of the German Colonial Society at Worms, and to the resolution passed thereat, which threatens British-Indian subjects of His Majesty, resident in German colonies, with differential legislation, and to the remarks of the Reichstag Deputy Herr Arnim to the effect that the Boers had passed sharp laws against the Indians and the British had taken them over, and that therefore there was no reason to fear complications with Great Britain; and whether, in view of the fact that His Majesty's Government could more effectively remonstrate with Foreign Powers than with our own people in the Colonies, he would, if necessary, take steps to protect His Majesty's British-Indian subjects in German Colonies from differential and humiliating legislation such as they are at present subjected to in certain of His Majesty's South African Colonies.

MR. MORLEY: I have seen a Report of the proceedings referred to. The question of taking steps for the purpose indicated will be considered if the contingency which the hon. Member contemplates should arise.

### Bombay-Sind Railway.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that on the 18th July last the Bombay Government stated that they had forwarded to the Government of India a memorial from the Cutchi inhabitants of Bombay relative to the proposed Bombay-Sind connection railway, will he ascertain why that memorial has not been submitted to him; and will he consider the points set forth in the memorial before a route is definitely adopted.

MR. MORLEY: The original memorial referred to has not yet been received by me. Under rule a memorial is forwarded with a full statement of facts and an expression of opinion by the Government. I presume that the transmission of this memorial has been delayed pending the consideration by the Government of India of the questions involved. I will inquire and will consider the memorial before finally approving either route. Meanwhile, there is no immediate prospect of the construction of a line.

### Rawal Pindi Public Meeting.

MR. C. J. O'DONNELL (Newington, Walworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the public meeting of zemindars at Rawal Pindi on the 21st April, for speaking at which three barristers are being prosecuted for sedition, passed resolutions complaining of the increase in the land revenue imposed at the present settlement, and authorising the district association to forward their petition and memorialise the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab for relief against the increased assessment, and complaining that, while the sugar and cotton industries of the country had well-nigh been destroyed by the competition of the well-organised capital and labour of foreign countries and the help given to them by their States in the shape of reduction of freights, the Government had increased the water rate on sugar-cane and cotton 100 per cent. in the tract irrigated by the Beas Doab Canal to the injury of those indigenous industries, which were already dying out; and whether he will issue instructions to prevent the increase of the land tax and the irrigation cess at the same time.

MR. MORLEY: I understand that one resolution referred to the recent revision of the land assessment in the Rawal Pindi district, and another to the revised water rates for the Bari Doab Canal. The Rawal Pindi district and the districts irrigated by the canal are some 300 miles apart. There was no question of simultaneous enhancement of land revenue and canal rates in the same districts. The increase in the canal rates was proposed as the result of inquiries which showed that the Bari Doab rates were below those of other similar canals, and that considerably higher rates could be paid without difficulty. The sugar-cane rate was increased by 50 per cent. and the cotton rate by 20 per cent. The area under these crops has increased largely and their cultivation is very profitable. The levy of the new rates has been postponed for twelve months, and all representations made by the cultivators regarding them are to be carefully considered.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): May I ask if it is not the case that the ryots of the Punjab on account of the construction of these works out of public revenues enjoy exceptional prosperity, and whether it is not just that they should contribute proportionately to the relief of the general taxpayer who provided the public revenues in question.

[No Answer was returned.]

### Rawal Pindi Riots.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the riots which took place at Rawal Pindi on 2nd May were due to the Land Colonisation Act; and, if so, whether he will advise the Government of India to suspend the operation of that Act pending a public inquiry.

MR. MORLEY: My hon. friend will have learned from the newspapers that the Viceroy has withheld his assent from the Colonisation Bill. I may say that his action has my entire approval. I must point out to my hon. friend what may possibly have escaped his attention, that the Rawal Pindi district was not affected by its provisions.

### Lalu Lajpat Rai.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the fact that the arrest and deportation of Lalu Lajpat Rai without trial has fired the indignation of His Majesty's subjects in India, he will either bring him to trial or release him, and so help to restore law and order and respect for British justice.

MR. MORLEY: I am aware that the circumstances mentioned by my hon. friend have been viewed with lively disapproval by some sections of His Majesty's Indian subjects and with lively approval by other sections, and I cannot at all agree with my hon. friend that either the trial or the release of the person detained would by any means help to restore law and order.

DR. RUTHERFORD asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would inform the House on what charge this gentleman had been arrested and deported without trial.

MR. MORLEY replied that under the regulations of 1818, under which he was arrested, the formulation of a charge that could be brought forward and substantiated was not necessary.

DR. RUTHERFORD asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had himself received any evidence justifying this serious undertaking on the part of the Indian Government.

MR. MORLEY said he had not the least desire to evade any of these questions, but it would be far more convenient if his hon. friend would possess himself in patience for only a week, when it would be his duty and satisfaction to explain to the House the whole of this matter.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.) said he desired to ask the right hon. Gentleman a simple question. Was it not a fact that this gentleman was arrested as a result of speaking at a meeting against the increase of the land and irrigation taxes; whether he considered that to be sedition, and whether it came within the purview of the regulations of 1818?

MR. MORLEY: My hon. friend calls that a simple Question! To answer it would involve me in complexities which would take at least half an hour.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) asked whether there was any other place under the British flag where these *lettres de cachet* obtained as they did in India.

[No Answer was returned.]

### Steamship Communication with East Africa.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any arrangement was made at the Colonial Conference whereby British lines of steamships may be able satisfactorily to compete with German State-aided lines upon the East Coast of Africa.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (MR. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The Answer is in the negative.

*MR. REES asked whether any consideration of the subject was contemplated.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir; the question of British communication between this country and the East Coast of Africa has been and will be most carefully considered.

### The Visit of the Colonial Premiers.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is any provision in the Estimates for the cost of entertaining the Colonial Ministers attending the recent Conference; and, if so, on which Vote and under which sub-head is such provision shown.

MR. CHURCHILL: Provision of £6,000 is made in the Estimates for 1907–8, Class II., Vote 6, Colonial Office, Sub-head D, Colonial Conference, "Expenses in connection with the Conference to be held in London in 1907 with the Premiers of the self-governing Colonies." It is understood that this Vote, which includes all the expenses of the Conference, will be somewhat exceeded.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: Are we to understand that the whole cost of the official entertainment of the Colonial Premiers will be charged on the Estimates, and, if so, were not the Colonial Premiers the guests of the nation and not of the Government?

MR. CHURCHILL: The whole cost of the official entertainment of the Colonial Ministers will be charged on the Estimates. The Colonial Ministers have always hitherto been entertained at the expense of the nation. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, in sending out the invitation in January, 1897, specially invited them to be "the guests of His Majesty's Government." That invitation was repeated in the same form on a subsequent occasion, and it is perfectly correct. The official description has always been as "the guests of His Majesty's Government."

MR. ARTHUR LEE: Are we to understand that His Majesty's Government in this particular are representing the nation?

MR. CHURCHILL: I am much surprised to hear a member of the Constitutional Party suggesting that the Ministers of the day, holding office under the Crown, have not a right to speak in the name of the nation.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Is the position this, that the Colonial Premiers have been the guests of the Government, but that their entertainment is to be paid for by the nation?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Report of the Imperial Conference.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in the publication of proceedings at the recent Imperial Conference, the discussion relating to publicity of proceedings will be printed.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir.

### The Rand Miners' Strike.

MR. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether there is any precedent for the employment of Imperial troops in a labour strike in a self-governing Colony; and, if not, what are the circumstances which have led the Governor of the Transvaal to sanction the use of upwards of 800 Imperial troops against the white miners on the Rand.

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know of any exact precedent for the intervention of Imperial troops in a labour dispute in a self-governing Colony; but neither can I find any parallel in the history of the British Empire to the conditions which prevail upon the Rand. Of their grave complexity the House is well aware, and His Majesty's Government have been led to the conclusion that no agency short of a free Parliament with a responsible Executive is capable of dealing with them with any prospect of success. Such a Government is now in office, and the Transvaal Parliament will meet on the 14th of June for the full debating of all matters affecting the Colony. Meanwhile the information which has been received from Lord Selborne as to the circumstances in which the employment of the Imperial troops has been resorted to is contained in the following telegram:—"During the strike on the Witwatersrand, Ministers, of course, have adopted attitude perfect impartiality towards employers and employees, but from the first they announced officially their determination to maintain law and order, to prevent violence or intimidation, and to protect property. They have now asked for detachments of His Majesty's forces in support of police, and I have issued necessary orders to General Officer Commanding to send them. I am convinced that this step is absolutely necessary and has not been taken without a full sense of responsibility on the part of my Ministers."

Mr. LEA asked whether the Government would consider the advisability, until the Transvaal Parliament had met, of instructing the High Commissioner that no Imperial troops should be used against the miners, and that any disturbances in connection with the strike should be put down by the local police, the Imperial troops only to be used in the event of an outbreak of the Chinese on the Rand?

Mr. CHURCHILL: It would not be in accordance with the policy of my noble friend to impose any such limitation on the action of the troops lent to the Transvaal Government.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): Has the right hon. Gentleman any information as to the state of affairs on the Rand?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have no further news, but I have reason to believe the trouble is abating.

Mr. WALSH (Lancashire, Ince) asked for information as to the exact nature of the disturbances that had occurred which needed the use of military against British workers on the Rand, and whether it had not been admitted that the troops were brought in owing to the presence of 50,000 Chinese.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Can the right hon. Gentleman say what the strike is about?

Mr. CHURCHILL said that he had received a telegram stating that a despatch was on its way home embodying a full account of the strike, its origin and course, which had been placed before the High Commissioner by the responsible Minister of Mines in the Transvaal. He had no detailed information of an official character.

Mr. WALSH: But cannot the right hon. Gentleman tell the House the nature of the social disorder which necessitated the employment of Imperial troops?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have said that a despatch is on its way. I have every confidence in the authorities on the spot and also in the Parliament there that will shortly discuss the subject.

Mr. MACKARNESS asked whether the right hon. Gentleman had seen the statement made by the acting Prime Minister of the Transvaal that the troops were asked for owing to the grave dangers feared through the presence of the Chinese.

Mr. CHURCHILL said that he had seen the statement, and it appeared to bear out the observation he had made upon it on Monday last, which was received with derision by hon. Members opposite.

### Dinuzulu.

Mr. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Dinuzulu, while paying a courtesy visit to bid farewell to the Governor of Natal during the present month, was subjected to an inquisitorial investigation before his Excellency, or other officials, and severely cross-examined with reference to the public charges which, for a long time past, have been permitted to be made against him of complicity in rebellion and murder; whether His Majesty's Government acquiesced in this trial of a loyal chief without the legal formulation of any charge, and gave authority to the representative of His Majesty in Natal to be party to this trial; whether His Excellency or the Natal Government propose to publish any report of the trial; and whether His Majesty's Government, in the interests of racial peace in Natal, will now take steps to protect Dinuzulu from newspaper charges, provocative of public disturbance, that he is disloyal to the British Sovereignty.

MR. CHURCHILL: Dinuzulu has, I understand, had a series of interviews with the Governor of Natal, but I am not aware that anything in the nature of a trial has taken place. It is not in the power of His Majesty's Government to control Press comments, and Dinuzulu must take his chance with the rest.

### The Hague Conference—Delegates' Powers.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can now state what powers, if any, are given to British delegates to The Hague Conference to bind this country to limit its naval and military forces.

MR. CHURCHILL (for Sir EDWARD GREY): My right hon. friend can only repeat the Answer already given to a similar Question on the 13th and 20th March. Any Convention which the delegates sign will be subject to the approval of His Majesty's Government and the subsequent ratification of the Sovereign.

### Shanghai Opium Traffic.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether British firms at Shanghai interested in the opium traffic have made any representations to the Foreign Office regarding the action taken or to be taken in connection with the anti-opium edict of the Chinese Government; and, if so, whether he will inform the House what reply such firms have received.

MR. CHURCHILL: An inquiry was some time ago addressed to His Majesty's Consul General at Shanghai by dealers in Indian opium at that port as to what action His Majesty's Government proposed to take in regard to the anti-opium proposals of the Chinese Government. Last month a reply was sent through His Majesty's Minister at Peking, that it was not possible at the present stage of the question to state the action which His Majesty's Government might eventually take on the proposals of the Chinese Government for restricting the importation of foreign opium; but that the request of the dealers to be made acquainted at the earliest possible date with the measures decided upon would be borne in mind. The memorialists were further informed that the summary of the Chinese Government's proposals, communicated to the Press from Peking, made it clear that a gradual restriction of the trade in the course of a term of years was contemplated.

MR. REES: I would ask whether the anti-opium edict is one of the ordinary official edicts of the Chinese Government.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am not prepared to say.

### British Subjects in the Congo Free State.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state approximately the number of British subjects, white and coloured, residing in the Congo Free State.

MR. CHURCHILL: We have no official data of our own on this point, but in the "Bulletin Officiel" of the Congo Government for the year 1906 we find that the total number of British subjects, though no distinction is made between white and coloured, is given as 139.

### British Consular Staff in the Upper Congo.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what independent means of communication, if any, is enjoyed by the British consular staff in the Upper Congo.

MR. CHURCHILL: The Vice-consuls at Leopoldville and Stanleyville have not any special means of communication. Should it prove necessary to provide such, the question of providing it will be considered.

### Metropolitan Police—Sunday Duty.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Holborn Division of Finsbury, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he proposes to increase the Metropolitan police force; and, if so, whether he will, in making the increase, consider the general wish that each man of the force should have one day's complete rest in every seven days.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have no intention of proposing any increase in the Metropolitan police force beyond the ordinary increase rendered necessary by the growth of population.

MR. COURTHOPE: Will the right hon. Gentleman give details of the estimate of £150,000 which he said it would cost to give the police one complete day's rest in seven?

MR. GLADSTONE: I shall be glad to give the hon. Member the information if he desires it.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that many local authorities in charge of the police give one day's rest in seven?

MR. GLADSTONE: I think there is only one case, at Reading.

### National Physique.

*CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether there are any statistics to show that the national physique has bettered or deteriorated during the last ten years, in addition to the findings of the Departmental Committee recently issued.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am not aware of the existence of any general official statistics on this subject. I think the deficiency is to be regretted.

### Foreign Lottery Circulars.

MR. G. A. HARDY (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the fact that a printer in Clerkenwell was fined £25 last week for distributing circulars in aid of a foreign lottery, and that circulars are now being distributed by post in London of a lottery in aid of a Roman Catholic church in Dublin, any steps will be taken to stop this distribution through the post.

MR. GLADSTONE: I understand that as these circulars were posted in closed envelopes the Post Office cannot take any action. I have, of course, no jurisdiction with regard to Irish lotteries.

### Newbury Railway Station.

MR. MACKARNESS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Great Western Railway station at Newbury is, on the down side, in some places not more than six feet wide and nowhere more than fourteen feet wide, and that express trains pass through it every day at from sixty to sixty-seven miles an hour; whether the station was built upwards of fifty years ago and is quite unfitted for the traffic and the trains which now pass through it, and that its continuance in its present condition is attended with danger to life and property; and whether he will inquire why the decision come to by the board of the company more than two years ago to build a new station has never been carried out.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE, Carnarvon Boroughs): The Board of Trade have again been in communication with the Railway Company in this matter, and have received a reply as follows:—

"Great Western Railway,
"General Manager's Office,
93348W. "Paddington Station,
"London, W.
"28th May, 1907.

"SIR,

"I am in receipt of your letter of to-day's date covering copy of a Notice of a further Question which Mr. Mackarness proposes to ask the President of the Board of Trade in the House of Commons to-morrow (Wednesday) relative to the Newbury station, and in reply do not find it possible to make any material addition to what was contained in my communication of 22nd March.

"The major portion of the platform is, as stated, approximately fourteen feet wide, but there is one spot—opposite the steps of the footbridge—where the space is necessarily reduced to about six feet. The Company is not, however, aware of any justification for the statement that the existing arrangements are 'attended with danger to life and property.'

"As was stated in my letter of 22nd March, the re-construction of the station will be taken in hand as soon as the Company is in possession of the necessary land.

"I am, etc.,
"(Sd.) JAMES C. INGLIS.

"The Assistant Secretary,
"(Railway Department)
"Board of Trade."

### Port of London.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade in view of the effect the declaration may have in saving naval expenditure on docks on the East Coast, whether he can indicate if the proposed legislation for the port of London next year will include a proposal for a dock capable of being used by the largest vessels such as a private dock company has power to construct at the present moment; and whether there is any reason to believe that the company in question are abstaining from exercising the powers conferred on them by Act of Parliament because of the uncertainty about future legislation.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: My hon. friend will readily understand that I am not in a position at present to make a statement as to the provisions which will be contained in the Bill which I hope to introduce next year, but one of its aims will be to improve the accommodation in the port of London. As regards the latter part of the Question I am not able to express an opinion.

### Oban Post Office.

Mr. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether a site has yet been obtained at Oban for the erection of a new post office; and when the building will be proceeded with.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): A site has now been found for the erection of a new post office at Oban, and the necessary steps are being taken for the completion of the purchase. It is hoped that a commencement may be made with the building at the beginning of next financial year.

### Salterhebble Church of England School.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the Board on 1st May decided to discontinue the grant to Salterhebble Church of England school at the close of this month; on what grounds the decision was made; what information on the subject has come into the possession of the Board since the 24th February last, when the Board wrote to the local education authority desiring that authority to reconsider its proposal to discontinue the maintenance of the school; if the Board have received any communication from the parents of children attending the school; and, if so, what is the nature of that communication.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. McKenna Monmouthshire, N.): I presume the hon. Member refers to the Halifax All Saints Church of England school. The Board intimated in September, 1903, that the premises of this school could only be recognised temporarily. In January last the local education authority informed the Board that as there was no sign of a new building being commenced, they proposed to discontinue maintenance. The Board suggested that as the managers now proposed to begin rebuilding the local education authority should reconsider their decision. The authority stated that in view of the fact that the existing building was unsafe and unhealthy they were not prepared to adopt this suggestion, and after consideration of a further report from their inspectors as to the condition of the premises the Board intimated that they would not interfere. I have received a petition from parents desiring the continuation of the school, but I cannot see my way to modify my previous decision.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN asked whether the delay in building these schools was originally due to alterations demanded by the corporation of Halifax and not to the managers, who had done all they could to hurry on the building of the schools.

Mr. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) inquired whether the right hon. Gentleman could say what distance the children attending the council school had to go, and whether it was not a fact that the council school was 100 feet below the level of the parish.

Mr. McKENNA: I must have notice of both these Questions. In regard to that of the hon. Member for Oswestry, I must point out that the first notice was given to the managers in September, 1903, and as we are now in the month of May, 1907, it does not matter what the action of the council was, but certainly ample time was given to the managers.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN wished to know what had occurred since February last to make the Board of Education alter their policy.

Mr. McKENNA: The Board sent down an inspector, and on his Report they decided not to over-rule the decision of the local authority.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Has the inspector reported that the school is both dangerous and insanitary?

Mr. McKENNA: That the building was dangerous and unhealthy.

### School Accommodation.

Mr. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether it is proposed to revise the recognised accommodation of provided schools in the same way and on the same scale as that of non-provided schools.

Mr. McKENNA: I must refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by my right hon. predecessor on 7th November last,† in which he stated that the aim of the Board of Education was to secure for each child in a public elementary school ten square feet of floor space. In the case of new schools or enlargements their practice now is always to insist on this; and, as regards existing schools, they endeavour to bring about the same state of things. But in exercising pressure to this end some regard has to be paid to the heavy burden that would be placed upon the rates by any sudden demand for so large an increase of school provision as would be entailed by a universal application of a ten feet scale.

Mr. COURTHOPE: I gather from the Answer that this is done only in the case of provided schools.

Mr. McKENNA: That is a very complicated question to answer. The rules that must guide the Board in the case of voluntary schools are not the same in enforcing satisfactory conditions as they are in the case of council schools.

Lord BALCARRES: The number of cubic feet required from a health point of view is the same in provided as in non-provided schools, is it not?

Mr. McKENNA: Precisely the same. We are endeavouring to bring the measure up to ten feet square in every case.

Mr. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education what provided and non-provided schools have been subjected to the revision of recognised accommodation during the past and present financial years.

Mr. McKENNA: The new List of Public Elementary Schools, which will, I hope, be published early next month, will show all changes in recognised accommodation occurring between 1st August, 1905, and 31st July, 1906. It would be impossible at present to give a list of changes occurring since that date, but they will be included in the next issue of the List of Schools.

### South Kensington Museum—Free Nights.

Mr. T. DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he will consider the advisability of changing one of the late free nights of the South Kensington Museum from Tuesday to Thursday in order that shop assistants may have an opportunity of visiting the institution who cannot do so at any time except on a Thursday evening.

Mr. McKENNA: The Board have now before them the question as to the times of opening of the Museum and my hon. friend's point will be borne in mind.

### Foreign Hops.

Mr. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether any steps have been taken by the Board of Agriculture either to prevent or to punish the infringement of Sections 5 and 6 of the Hop Act, 1866, by importers and vendors of foreign hops; and whether the Board of Agriculture will render these sections effective by instituting proceedings against those who violate their provisions in future.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxiv., 550–1.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): We are advised that it is not clear that Section 5 of the Act to which the hon. Member refers is applicable to foreign hops and that Section 6 certainly does not do so. In any case the Board are not empowered to take steps either to prevent or to punish infringements of those enactments.

### Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland, in view of the course adopted by the Standing Committee on the Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill, if he will state when he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Education (Scotland) Bill.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): As soon as possible; but I am not able to say more at present.

### Proposed Irish Council.

LORD BALCARRES: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Blackpool Division of Lancashire I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why it is proposed that the cost of the first election to the Irish Council shall be provided by Parliament and not by the Irish Exchequer as for subsequent elections.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): As the financial provisions of the Bill will not come into force until after the first Council has been elected, it is considered reasonable that the expenses of the first election should be borne by Parliament.

### Mr. Justice Ross and Disorder in Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the remarks of Mr. Justice Ross, on 17th May, in connection with a case of driving cattle off a grass farm at Shrole, county Roscommon, that a widespread and audacious conspiracy is at present rampant in the West of Ireland, which on ordinary moral grounds amounted to highway robbery; and whether the Government will take more energetic measures to check the intimidation which is being practised.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down E.): At the same time may I ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the remarks of Mr. Justice Ross on the intimidation practised in connection with the letting of lands on the Chancery estate of G. A. Kelly, a minor, in county Roscommon, and the existence of a widespread conspiracy to prevent the lands in hand on this and other estates in the West of Ireland from being let; and whether he proposes to take any, and, if any, what, action in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The observations of Mr. Justice Ross, as reported in the newspapers, include the statement attributed to him in the Question. There is no evidence before the Government showing that a widespread conspiracy is rampant in the West of Ireland. It is, however, the fact that cattle have been driven off farms in a number of individual cases, and, as I have repeatedly stated, the police are taking energetic measures to prevent such acts, and to bring offenders to justice. In the particular case to which Mr. Justice Ross referred, a prosecution was directed a week before he made the remarks quoted, and that prosecution is now pending.

MR. LONSDALE: Does the right hon. Gentleman admit that there is considerable disturbance and disorder in this part of Ireland?

MR. BIRRELL: I have repeatedly stated that in certain limited areas of Ireland there is considerable cause for anxiety.

### Arson in Kildysart.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received information of the destruction by fire of a quantity of hay in the district of Kildysart, county Leitrim, recently; and whether any persons have been prosecuted in connection with these fires.

MR. BIRRELL: Kildysart is in county Clare, not Leitrim. I am informed by the police authorities that one case of burning has occurred in that district, namely, the destruction of a rick of hay on the 1st instant. No prosecution has been instituted.

### Mr. P. J. Kelly J.P.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether renewed attention has been called recently to the conduct of Mr. P. J. Kelly J.P., on the Gurteen bench; and whether the Lord Chancellor has taken, or intends to take, any action in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The Lord Chancellor informs me that his attention has not been called to any conduct of Mr. Kelly on the Gurteen bench, but recently his attention was directed to a report of certain proceedings at Athenry Petty Sessions at which Mr. Kelly was one of the presiding magistrates. The Lord Chancellor did not consider that the report disclosed any action on Mr. Kelly's part which called for his interference.

### Roscomroe Disturbances.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of times recently that the stock of Mr. Luttrell have been driven off his farm at Roscomroe; how many police are stationed in the neighbourhood; and whether he will see that a sufficient force is provided to check the lawless acts of agitators who desire to dispossess Mr. Luttrell of his lands.

MR. BIRRELL: Mr. Luttrell's cattle were driven off his farm on two occasions, namely, 30th April and 18th May, and proceedings are being taken against a number of persons in each of these cases. Since the 22nd instant, a police force consisting of a district inspector and twenty-five men has been encamped on the farm for the purpose of preventing further interference with the cattle. The farm is remote from a police station, the two nearest stations being six and seven miles away.

### Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of recruits for the Royal Irish Constabulary obtained during the first quarter of 1907, and the number obtained during the corresponding quarter of 1906.

MR. BIRRELL: The number of recruits for the Royal Irish Constabulary enrolled in the first quarter of 1907 was 204, and the number for the corresponding quarter of 1906 was 140.

MR. LONSDALE: Can the right hon. Gentleman account for the difference?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes. Twenty-five years ago the Irish force was largely increased and the period of retirement of the men then recruited is now falling due, consequently there are more vacancies to be filled up.

### Re-instatement of Evicted Tenants.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state when he will be in a position to give to the House the results of the investigations into the claims of evicted tenants to be reinstated in their holdings.

MR. BIRRELL: As I have already informed the House, the Estates Commissioners will immediately after the end of this month proceed to draw up a special Report upon the cases of evicted tenants which have then been investigated. The Commissioners anticipate that this Report will be ready by the middle of next month, and I shall then make a statement on the subject as soon as may be possible.

MR. LONSDALE: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman give the number reinstated?

MR. BIRRELL: I should prefer the hon. Member to wait for the Report.

### Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state the course which the Government intend to pursue in regard to the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill.

MR. BIRRELL: This is not a Government measure. The Bill has been committed to a Standing Committee, of which my right hon. friend the Attorney-General for Ireland and myself are members. I have no statement to make on the subject at present.

MR. LONSDALE: Do the Government intend to take the Bill up?

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. Member had better wait and see what course the Bill takes.

### Irish Land Purchase—Advances by the Estate Commissioners.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have in any, and, if so, how many, cases sanctioned advances of over £3,000 for the purchase of holdings, and in how many cases have they refused to sanction such advances under The Land Purchase (Ireland) Act, 1903.

MR. BIRRELL: The hon. Member will find the information for which he asks up to 31st March, 1906, on page 28 of the last Annual Report of the Estates Commissioners and on page 19 of the Appendix to the Report. Further information on the subject will be given in the Commissioners' Report for the year ending 31st March last which is at present in course of preparation.

### Irish Land Purchase—Agreements for Sale.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in the case of how many estates in Ireland have agreements for sale under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1903, been lodged; in how many have the sales been completed and purchase money allocated; and in how many cases of agreements lodged so far back as 1904 are the sales still not completed.

MR. BIRRELL: Agreements for sale under the Act of 1903 have been lodged in respect of 4,727 estates, and advances have been made in respect of 1,494 of these estates. The Estates Commissioners inform me that the sales have been completed in nearly all the cases in respect of which agreements were lodged in 1904. It would not be possible to state precisely how many of the latter cases are still outstanding without a minute investigation of the Commissioners' records, which would occupy a considerable time.

### Belfast Resident Magistrates.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the disparity of the provision made for resident magistrates in Belfast as compared with that made for the police magistrates of Dublin, the Government will give facilities for the Belfast Resident Magistrates Bill at present before the House.

MR. BIRRELL: Having regard to the present state of public business, I am afraid that the Government could not give special facilities for this Bill, which, as the hon. Member is aware, is not a Government measure.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Has the right hon. Gentleman made up his mind to do nothing for the North of Ireland?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir; I have not made up my mind.

### Agrarian Outrages in Connaught.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in how many cases, during the month ending 25th May, have cattle been forcibly driven off farms in Ireland, and in how many cases have prosecutions followed; have extra police, and, if so, how many, been drafted into the province of Connaught to prevent cattle driving or other forms of outrage; and in how many cases are police encamped upon farms that have been raided or are threatened with cattle driving raids.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that during the month ended 25th May, approximately, twenty cases of driving cattle off farms occurred, and prosecutions have been instituted in eight of these cases. During the same period six police officers and 280 men were drafted into Connaught. In two cases policemen are encamped on farms, one being in county Roscommon and the other in King's County.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Can the right hon. Gentleman say how the disparity arises between the number of cases and the number of prosecutions?

MR. BIRRELL: We institute prosecutions where we get the necessary evidence.

### Royal Irish Constabulary and Grazing Farm Disputes.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in certain disturbed districts in Ireland, and in cases where disorderly crowds have to be dispersed, or where graziers and other persons obnoxious to the United Irish League have to be protected from active intimidation and assault, the Royal Irish Constabulary have received instructions from headquarters that under no circumstances are they to make arrests, and that, if it is necessary to take legal proceedings to vindicate the law, it must be done by summons; and whether, in view of the failure of the police to maintain order in these districts, he will see that these instructions are revoked and that the police are armed with powers as full as are accorded to the police in England and Scotland.

MR. BIRRELL: No such instructions have been issued to the police.

### Royal Irish Constabulary Reserve.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what is the number of men usually held in reserve at the Royal Irish Constabulary Depot, Dublin, and what was the number in reserve on the 20th instant; and how many men have been drafted from the depot to the various disturbed districts in the South and West of Ireland since 1st January last.

MR. BIRRELL: The number of men of the Reserve Force of the Royal Irish Constabulary which may be available at the depot at any time depends upon the number which may be absent on duty throughout the country. On 20th instant the number of the Reserve Force actually at the depot was 143. Since 1st January last 177 men of the Reserve have been drafted from the depot into various districts in Ireland.

### Royal Irish Constabulary Recruits.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the number of recruits at present undergoing training at the Royal Irish Constabulary Depot in Dublin; and whether orders have been issued for the immediate enrolment of 180 additional recruits; and, if so, what is the necessity for so materially increasing the number of the police force in Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL: The number of recruits at present in training is 320. No orders have been issued for the enrolment of recruits beyond the number required to fill vacancies caused by the ordinary wastage of the force.

### Loughrea Raids.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Thursday, the 9th instant, the houses of Thomas Glynn, Michael Egan, and George Earkins, in Coorheen, Kileenadeema, Loughrea, were raided and searched for arms by men with masked faces; whether any persons have been arrested in connection with the matter; what is the nearest police station to the scene of the outrage; and what steps are the police taking in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that the facts are as stated in the Question. No person has been arrested. The nearest police station is Loughrea, two miles distant. The police are making every possible effort to bring the offenders to justice.

### Athenry Outrage.

MR. COURTHOPE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the night of the 15th instant, at about 11 o'clock, the house of Thomas Duddy, situated in the centre of the town of Athenry, was fired into, and that the fact that Duddy drove some of the police on his car contrary to the orders of the United Irish League in that town is assigned as the cause of the outrage; and whether, in view of the fact that several similar cases of firing into houses in Athenry have occurred during the last two years, he will increase the police force there, and will supply them with fuller powers for detecting and preventing crime of this character.

MR. BIRRELL: Thomas Duddy's house was fired into on the date mentioned.

It is the fact that Duddy drove the police on his car a month ago, but the police have no reason to believe that this fact furnished the motive for the firing, and so far as they are aware the United Irish League has in no way interferred in the matter. The police force at Athenry Station has been increased by twenty-five men, making the present number forty-one. The police possess full powers for the prevention and detection of crime. The state of the district has been and is receiving the closest possible attention.

### Unlawful Assembly Trial in the West of Ireland.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether it is intended to apply to the King's Bench for orders to change the venue of trials for unlawful assembly at present pending in connection with attempts to prevent the letting of grazing lands in the West of Ireland to places where there would be some prospect of a fair trial; and whether it is intended to do so in the case in county Leitrim where persons of the name of Brady are boycotted, and in the pending cases from the Athenry district in county Galway.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): I have no intention at present of applying for a change of venue in the cases referred to in the Question; nor have I any reason to believe that the accused persons will not receive a fair trial in the counties in which they will, in ordinary course, be tried at the coming summer assizes.

MR. MOORE: Is it not the fact that two juries consecutively have disagreed in the case of raiders in Connaught?

[No Answer was returned.]

### Indian Budget Debate.

SIR H. COTTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to the character of the interests involved, to the anxiety felt in this House and in the country regarding the present position of affairs in India, to the fact that the debate on the Budget is the only occasion afforded to the House to discuss Indian subjects, and to the importance of allowing the Secretary of State an opportunity of making a full reply to the questions raised, he will allow the discussion on the Indian Budget this year to be extended over two days.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I think one day should suffice—it will be a full day—unless in the meantime new incidents should arise, which I hope will not be the case.

### Land Values (Scotland) Bill.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can state when the Land Values (Scotland) Bill, which was presented and read a first time in the House on Monday, 13th May, will be printed.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: There has been some unavoidable delay, but I understand the Bill will shortly be printed.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): Has there been any change in the details of the Bill since its introduction?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Bill when printed will be found to be in perfect accordance with the statement of my right hon. friend in introducing it.

MR. MOORE: Was that course followed in the case of the Irish Council Bill?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: To the best of my belief it was.

### All-British Mail Route.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he has taken any steps with regard to the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the cost of and the other measures necessary for the establishment of a fast All-British mail route, as recommended by the Imperial Conference and promised by His Majesty's Government.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade is now examining the matter departmentally with the aid of experts, and until the investigation is further advanced it is not possible to say whether the appointment of a formal Committee will be necessary. As to the nature of the assurances given on this subject by His Majesty's Government, the House had better wait until the proceedings of the Conference are published.

---

## SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A (in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill): Sir Henry Norman; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Limited Partnerships Bill): Mr. Joseph Pease.

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added the following Member to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills (in respect of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill): Lord Willoughby de Eresby.

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Vaccination Bill): Sir Edward Strachey; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Attorney-General.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

---

## *NEW BILL.*

---

## INJURED ANIMALS ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Injured Animals Act, 1894," presented by Sir Howard Vincent; supported by Sir William Brampton Gurdon and Sir Frederick Banbury; to be read a second time upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 214.]

---

## TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES (EXPENSES).

Resolution reported; "That it is expedient to authorise the payment out of money voted by Parliament for Army services of necessary expenditure incurred by associations in pursuance of any Act of the present session to provide for the reorganisation of His Majesty's military forces, and for that purpose to authorise the establishment of county associations and the raising and maintenance of a Territorial Force and to amend the Acts relating to the Reserve Forces."

Resolution read a second time:—

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Mr. BUCHANAN, Perthshire, E.), who was indistinctly heard in the gallery, was understood to say that a month or six weeks ago he laid on the Table of the House an approximate estimate of the cost of the Territorial Army when it came into existence, amounting to £2,800,000. Since then an additional estimate of £625,000 had been presented to the House. Of that amount about one-third—£200,000—was due to items which were specifically excluded from the original estimate, and £425,000 represented concessions which had been made by his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War in answer to representations which had been made to him by Members of the House. He thought he was within the mark in saying that those Estimates were ample. They represented what was believed to be the maximum cost of the new force. It was, he thought, impossible that they could be exceeded, and they could not, in any probability, be reached for a large number of years. They had endeavoured to give the maximum estimate of the Territorial Force mobilised on a war footing. It was, of course, largely in excess of any establishment of forces that would be wanted in time of peace. That alone gave them a very large margin to work upon. There were margins also in the various other items, and it would take a long series of years to work up to anything like that total. With regard to the sum entered for a second suit of clothes, the item allowed for that did not represent the total cost of a second suit of clothes given to the 300,000 odd men in the Territorial Army. It was more than ample to allow for the upkeep of a suit of clothes, which was taken to last for four years. The sum was calculated on that basis, and it left a very considerable margin for any possible extravagance in any individual association.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) asked where was the sum for the original cost of providing those clothes.

MR. BUCHANAN replied that they did not propose to provide the men with clothes right away. The uniforms they already possessed would be handed over to the county associations.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): If the walking out suit is to last four years, how long is the service suit supposed to last?

MR. BUCHANAN said it would probably last two or three years. These figures were based on the experience already obtained in the Volunteers. He was very anxious that the estimate he had laid before the House should not be increased, but he felt confident that within the figure indicated they would be perfectly able to bear to the full the necessary expenses for the Territorial Force. As regarded the method of payment to the associations, it was intended that there should be a Vote for the Territorial Army, and ultimately that Vote would supersede the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer Votes, which would gradually decrease as the Territorial Army Vote went up. Under the Bill the bulk of the money for the Territorial Army would be paid over to the county associations. The general lines upon which they proposed to go were those of the existing Volunteer Vote, but they were going to introduce certain modifications with regard to the payments under that Vote which experience had shown to be desirable. Instead of including everything under capitation grants, they proposed to separate certain fixed charges which depended not upon the numbers of the corps concerned, but were fixed from year to year as necessary to each unit. They would thus divide off the charges which might be looked upon as of a more or less permanent character, and those which necessarily varied from year to year. They could work out from past experience what the establishment charges were, and they would go upon that. The capitation grant seemed to him to be quite adequate. They would insist on compensation being paid for drill halls, and money would be provided for that purpose. They would be maintained in the future by means of a sinking fund, but the Government could not hold out any hope of being able to advance capital to purchase them. The last paragraph of the Resolution showed the means by which they wished to secure the control over the finances of the county associations. At the present moment the colonel of a Volunteer regiment had control over its expenditure, its efficiency, and so forth, but in future that duty would fall upon the general officer in command of the district, while every person would be made responsible. That system would furnish them with the true mode in which capitation grants should be made. The accounts would be open to the inspection of the Accountant General of the War Office and the Auditor and Comptroller-General. The control over the money spent ought to be no less complete than that over the money spent at the present moment on the Volunteers and Auxiliary Forces, and the Government were in favour of securing that. The method by which they proposed to secure sufficient control over the associations was this: At the present moment the various colonels sent in the nominal roll of men who were efficient, but the money was distributed through other channels. They proposed to make the officer, probably the brigadier who furnished them with the nominal roll, ultimately responsible, because they would pay the capitation grant on that. Money, as he had stated, would not be put under the control of the Territorial Army but under the general control of the officials dealing with the service. He could not at present add anything to that statement, but he would be glad to answer any inquiries on the subject. The accounts sent up would be available for inspection by the Accountant-General of the War Office and the Comptroller-General. The estimate of the cost of the Territorial Army was, in his judgment, ample, and when the three Auxiliary Forces were amalgamated he thought we should have a better fighting force in the second line organised on the general principles of unity, and at a lower cost than we had at the present moment.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said that perhaps the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down was one of the highest authorities in the House on the control by the House and the Treasury of the expenditure of the country. The Financial Secretary had won his distinction in the House by his services in regard to that question. He had alluded to the control of the House as being as continuous and as complete as it was in the case of the Volunteers, a remark which he ventured to say in a recent debate by means of a disorderly interruption meant "none at all," because the House really enjoyed no control over the Volunteers. This was a matter for the House of Commons and the House of Commons alone. There was no doubt that the question which they discussed last night and left unfinished must be cleared up by Amendments to Clauses 12 and 32, which were not discussed. The matter could not be left as it was. But, the question which they were now discussing was one in regard to which they had the final and effective voice, and after all that they had learned of military finance in the last five or six years and of the changes of opinion during the time of the late Government—the difference of views between the War Office, the Treasury, and the Army Council which came before the Public Accounts Committee—they could not pass this matter by in silence. They must know where they were in regard to the control of the Territorial Army, and that was peculiarly a House of Commons matter for which there would be no other opportunity of discussion. It seemed that in the future they would have one Vote instead of three Votes in regard to the Territorial Forces, and in so far as that was the fact it was not a change for the better as regarded the control of the House, because it deprived them of the advantage of discussing the separate services separately. The statement that the funds were to be handed over to the county associations as those of a "going concern" was very vague, and they did not know how it affected stores and equipments in hand. A reply seemed moreover to indicate that the pay and allowances would be under the control of the commanding officer in camp while other expenses would be accounted for by the county associations. On the 10th of May the Secretary of State went into more detail. The right hon. Gentleman said the grants would be applicable only to authorised objects. At the present moment in the case of the Volunteers that was so, but the money being given in more or less a lump sum the choice between the authorised objects was one that was not within the control of Parliament at all. His right hon. friend went on and clearly showed that he did not draw a sound distinction between audit and appropriation, audit being secured in every case, but appropriation being secured by a certain system peculiar to this country. Audit was one thing, but appropriation was another. They were satisfied that the audit would be all right. They were concerned about the appropriation and desired to be satisfied about that. The hon. Gentleman who had just spoken knew how controversy raged between the Army Council and the Public Accounts Committee three or four years ago.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington) was understood to say that that was a superstition.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he relied on the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee and not on unauthorised statements by gentlemen outside the House, whose knowledge, however, no one could doubt. No one could doubt the knowledge of Mr. Bowles on the subject. He based his observations on the facts brought before the Committee by the reports of the Public Accounts Committee and on the changes made based on the Order in Council. That was not superstition unless the right hon. Gentleman replied that the Public Accounts Committee and Parliament and the Cabinet and the Treasury that backed up the Committee against the Army Council were all wrong. The Public Accounts Committee had named three flagrant cases where money had been taken for one purpose and expended on another. The audit was all right. It was a question of appropriation pure and simple. Those cases were in the index, but he did not desire to read them to the House. They were in the Report and he could point to the pages where they appeared. One was a Volunteer case in which an expenditure was taken under the Volunteer Vote for one purpose and expended on a purpose other than that for which it was intended. Then there was a case last year upon which they reported that the terms of the Order in Council of August, 1902, had been exceeded, as there had been a diversion of money from its proper course. The excuse they gave might assist his right hon. friend, although it was not a good reason at the time it was given, and therefore he would make him a present of it for what it was worth. It was that there was a lack of finality in dealing with the Auxiliary Forces. He presented it to his right hon. friend because the right hon. Gentleman no doubt believed he was reaching finality by this reorganisation. But the House ought to know what was the finality they were reaching. There was another case which the Public Accounts Committee reported, in which they stated that the payment of capitation grants was conditional on the fulfilment of certain obligations laid down by the Order in Council, and that those provisions had not been complied with. The way to prevent these things happening in future was clearly to insure that the Treasury regulations should be Treasury regulations and not Army Council regulations; that they should be inspired not by Army Council but by Treasury views if there happened to be a difference of opinion, and that they should be in a form which would commend them to Parliament. In the Bill before the House there was a provision for laying these Treasury regulations before Parliament, but anyone reading those words would find nothing in their provisions which gave a power of disallowance. They were not to be effectively laid before Parliament. They were to be produced. There was to be no laying them on the Table for so many days, and he was afraid that laying before Parliament would be of an illusory character unless Parliament could wring from the Treasury to-day regulations to secure not only audit but appropriation in the sense Parliament desired. These were questions which excited much interest in the House. There were questions upon the Paper now. One was to be asked to-morrow on this subject. Surely it was much better that these matters should not be dealt with at Question time, but that the answers should be given in that debate. He could not help thinking that under the Bill the loose system of finance which had hitherto been confined to the Volunteers would be to some extent extended. It was limited in some ways, in the ways previously announced by his hon. friend, who had made certain divisions under certain heads, which was an improvement so far as it went, but it was extended in another sense because more money was going to be spent. If the new system was to be a good one the expenditure would have to be an increasing one, and the system of finance the House was adopting ought to be carefully scrutinised, as it would be the military financial system of the future. Coming to detail, he would repeat that what they wanted was not audit, but appropriation, which was quite different from audit and much more difficult to obtain, and was peculiar to this country. The precedents were such as to make it reasonable. When the Yeomanry went out to war, there was a grotesque appropriation of money, entirely through the looseness of the military finance. In such a case the audit would detect certain evils but not others. The money would be spent, but not spent in the way intended. He asked hon. Members interested in the subject to look at the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee and at the Order in Council issued by the late Government after the dispute between the Army Council and the Treasury. In the Order was laid down the principle upon which the House ought to act. It was sufficiently secured by the Order in Council. He now came to questions of detail. The original estimate criticised on the Second Reading of the Bill was called an approximate estimate. He did not blame any one for that, because it was admittedly a difficult matter to estimate for a change of this kind. The difficulties were very great. They had now an additional estimate upon the subject. He had read with surprise in the Paper in his hand and had heard with surprise to-day the statement made by his hon. friend the Financial Secretary that it was an estimate that ought not to be laid before the House; that it was a war estimate; an inflated estimate; an estimate for a state of things that could never exist. Why should the Government give such an estimate—an estimate which in the very nature of affairs was an extreme estimate. It was almost too good. It was like a prospectus.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): It will never go to allotment.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said his own view of the estimate would be the other way. It would be an under estimate, not for abnormal but for normal circumstances. The hon. Gentleman had repeated to-day that it was ample; that it was a war estimate and therefore gave a large margin in time of peace: but, it would enable them to spend for one purpose what they happened to have for another. He did not wish to overstate the case, but his suggestion to the House was that they were voting a lump sum, and that the figures were not given to the House. There were certain points mentioned on the Second Reading which remained outside this estimate altogether. There was an additional estimate for certain forms of equipment, but that meant storage for equipment, which cost more than the equipment itself. Storage was not always connected with the drill hall, and it was a matter in regard to which different battalions in different counties stood in very different positions. It was doubtful in his mind how far, as regarded the points that were named, the expenditure on drill halls and on ranges was satisfactorily met in the estimate before them, and he mentioned them as items and matters which ought to be considered. As regarded camp allowances, they were left in a nebulous position; the matter was extremely vague. He would like to ask the House to notice one of the assurances given to them on that subject. The Secretary of State had constantly used the words "substantially the same." He said that the Yeomanry were to be treated in "substantially the same" way as at present, but he then said that he repudiated the suggestion that there was to be one standard for the Yeomanry and another for everybody else; he said that it was to be an all round standard. As to camp allowance, it included all kinds of different things; did that allowance mean an increase all round, on a certain scale, for infantry and other branches of the Territorial Army, as had been promised to the Yeomanry? If so, he could not see that the money could possibly be sufficient. The figure of 2s. a head, which had been mentioned, was greatly exceeded in the case of the fifteen days camp, and in some parts of the country it might be 4s. and 5s. a day for pay alone for the fifteen days camp. They ought to make a distinction between the Regular soldier, who was engaged all the year round for several years, and the Volunteer who was in camp for the public service for fifteen days. It was quite a different thing inducing a man to go into camp for fifteen days; they must offer him more liberal terms than they would to a man who took up soldiering as his trade for the whole year round. The difference between the two cases was very great. It was perfectly defensible to give the Volunteer better rations for the short time he was in camp in order to make him a happier man, than it was thought necessary to give in the case of a man with whom they were dealing all the year round. The principle laid down in the House of Lords by Lord Portsmouth as being the prin. ciple of the Bill was, he thought, a sound one, that the men, to use the noble Lord's own term—though it was not carried out in the estimate—were to be paid for every day they were at work. But it could not be shown that that principle was acted upon in regard to the infantry force in the accounts which they had before them. There were a great many matters outside the estimate which would increase the amount to be spent under the Bill. There were promises given in the House of Lords as to the men enlisted before the Bill became law, and there was also the promise in regard to the Militia battalions who joined the Territorial Army. In that case there was a promise given in the House of Lords that a higher course of training than the mere fifteen days would be required, but that it was a question of money. Undoubtedly the question of money would become more important before the Bill passed into law. These battalions must receive the higher rate of pay, but there was no provision for it in the Territorial Army Estimate. The Secretary of State had made one satisfactory promise on this subject since the Second Reading debate. There was a certain vagueness before that debate as to how far they were going to have appeals for public subscriptions to finance the Territorial Army. But Questions had been put to the right hon. Gentleman who had pledged himself that the hat was not to be sent round for the Territorial Army. Therefore, they had to face the financing of the matter, and put it on a thoroughly sound basis. That was now understood. They had got to finance the Territorial Army. He would just mention two heads out of the four or five about which his hon. friend opposite had asked for an explanation. Clothing was a matter which had excited great attention in the House, and about which a great number of Questions had been put. There had been difficulty in finding out exactly what was meant. He had given attention to the subject, but he confessed that he had not the least idea what was meant. The Answers which had been given to the Questions put had not cleared up the matter. The Answer to the hon. Member for Darlington was that the cost of one suit was 10s. 5d. a head. Whoever supplied the Answer to his right hon. friend had supplied it badly. The Question was repeated, and the Answer was corrected.

Mr. HALDANE: No, no.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: I confess I thought so.

Mr. HALDANE: The same Answer was given.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: You mean the Question of the new suit?

Mr. HALDANE: Yes.

*Sir CHARLES DILKE: Well, the one new suit was £2 17s. 3d. per man, or £829,000. That was one suit. But how did that work out with the figures which had been given that day? He had read through the accounts to try to make out what he could buy for the sum, but he had not succeeded. Although the different arms varied very much in their requirements, yet the 10s. 5d. did not appear to be borne out even if the one suit was to last two or three years. [An Hon. Member: Four years.] Four years for a walking out suit and two or three years for the working suit. On neither of those principles could he account for the particular figures. This was not a 2½d. matter, because everybody knew that the question of clothing had a very important bearing on a force. Frequently the best men of a regiment were the worst dressed, the reason being that they were often concerned in its finance, and they made their clothes last as long as possible; they were the older men, and probably did not care about looking smart; but for the young recruits they ought to provide the dress on a liberal scale to make it more attractive, and it was by no means the worst class of recruit that they attracted in that way. The walking-out suit lasted four years. They could not get a walking-out suit for four times 10s. 5d., if they included the cap or helmet, and other items. They were told last night that they were going to be put on an equal footing; were they going to be put on an equal footing in respect of all these things? Was the Territorial Army going to have what the Militia had got by pressure? One word as to the adjutants. The financial question with regard to the adjutants had been as difficult to him as in regard to the other matters. If they looked at the total amount under the different heads of the Army Estimates, the sum for adjutants was a very large one indeed. If they looked at the cost of the adjutants one by one they found, roughly speaking, that it averaged £1 a day per head. It seemed to him that taking adjutant by adjutant, they got a sum very much larger than the estimate. The new estimate gave £140,000 additional to the £100 per year. The total cost of the adjutants appeared to be much higher than the sum of £260,000 allowed by the Secretary of State for War. Taking even that as the amount, if they deducted the £140,000 that gave an excess of £120,000, and he was quite sure there was nothing like that sum put down in the original return. That was a matter upon which he thought the House ought to have clear information. The non-effective point had been thoroughly explained, but there remained the question of bounties. It was difficult to ascertain how far bounties came within this Resolution. In Ireland they had a different scheme, and that scheme became more and more doubtful every day because they had hitherto understood that in Ireland the Militia were going to continue as Militia. After what was said last night the Militia in Ireland appeared to be assuming the form of a new type of Regulars. The battalions which took the place of the Regular Reserve battalions here would exist in Ireland. As there were going to be Territorial Associations in Ireland he did not know how far those bounties would form a part of the Territorial Army or the Regular Army schemes. He would like some information on that point. The questions asked in the House of Lords showed that the Government were considering annual and additional bounties and special Irish Militia bounties which might or might not fall within the words of this Resolution and about which they were entitled to some information. Far from being grossly over-estimated, he thought the cost had been under-estimated. As for the depots, he imagined that they were outside this Resolution. The third part of the Bill was not Territorial Army finance, and could be done by the Army authorities without a Bill. In the annual memorandum dealing with the British Army there was a paragraph about depots, in which the Inspector-General for Recruiting referred to the detrimental effect upon recruiting which was produced by the miserable condition in which the depots were. Under this Bill those depots would continue to be used for another class of men, and that fact could not be looked forward to without contemplating a large expenditure upon those depots. He apologised to the House for the time he had taken up, and concluded by repeating his belief that the subjects raised in the debate were deserving of the attention of the Government.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) said he did not propose to follow the right hon. Baronet into the details of his speech. He agreed with him when he said he had quoted sufficient cases to prove that the estimate now presented to the House certainly under-estimated the cost. He proposed to deal more with the question of the control of the House of Commons and the Public Accounts Committee over the expenditure. At Question time he asked the Secretary for War if he would refer his statement of requirements in which his estimate was presented to the House to the Public Accounts Committee for consideration and report, and the right hon. Gentleman seemed a little doubtful as to whether there were any precedents for such a reference. Sir Erskine May laid down that under established usage important changes in the customary form of the Estimates should not be made without the previous approval of the Public Accounts Committee acting on behalf of the House of Commons, and, in deference to that principle, official alterations of the Estimates were restricted to such arrangements as involved no question of principle. Last year some small changes were made in the Army Estimates, but they were submitted to the Public Accounts Committee who expressed their approval of the suggested change . After the speech made by the Financial Secretary to the War Office it was clear that Votes 3, 4, and 5 for the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers would ultimately disappear, and their place would be taken by a comprehensive Vote for the Territorial Forces. The difficulty which many of them experienced in endeavouring to understand the numerous Papers which had been laid before them by the Army Council in reference to this Bill had been to distinguish between the estimates made for the Territorial Force and money which was to be provided for the work of the County Associations. Did the amount put down include the whole cost of the operations which would devolve upon the county organisations under the Bill? The first estimate presented stated that no provision was made in the estimate for the initial expenditure upon guns, rifles, and capital expenditure upon drill halls and rifle ranges. Had the Government formed any estimate of what that cost would be? There did not appear to be any provision for such things as the secretariat of the County Associations.

MR. BUCHANAN: The particulars are given on page 4.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH thought the principle adopted was to include everything which was not specially connected with the actual training and equipment of the soldiers. Out of the money voted to meet the necessary expenditure connected with the exercise and discharge by the association of its powers and duties, the association would have to defray the cost of the official staff, the rent or acquisition of their offices, the establishment and maintenance of rifle clubs, and other matters. According to information which they had, Parliament would be asked to provide the money under certain heads, with the deliberate knowledge that the county associations, if they were to carry out the purposes of the Act, would have to spend the money on purposes of which Parliament was ignorant at the time it passed the Votes. It was essential, in the first place, that the House should know the objects for which they were asked to vote certain sums of money. Unless they knew the whole system of appropriation absolutely fell to the ground. Unless they got that information it would be impossible for the House to see whether the money had been spent in the manner intended. He regretted that it had not been found possible in the numerous Papers which had been presented to hon. Members to give a more detailed statement as to the form in which the Estimates would be presented to the House of Commons. The hon. Gentleman had stated plainly that afternoon that the Government were going to proceed on the lines of the Volunteer Vote. He had heard that statement with considerable regret. It might or might not have been the best way of dealing with the Volunteer Vote in the past, but certainly it was not a justification for the method being extended, not only to a much larger sum of money, but to the possibility of the money being spent in numerous different ways. He was not at all sure that under the Bill as it now stood even the very modified control which the House had over the expenditure of the Volunteers would be preserved. Of course it was possible that under the Orders in Council which would be necessary under the Bill means would be taken to see that the Comptroller and Auditor-General had full access to all the books and papers of the different associations. At present he had access to the accounts of the Volunteer corps for the purpose of examination.

MR. BUCHANAN: There would be the same power.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said he would like to see that statement in the Bill itself if it could be got in. He would have preferred to have something in a clause to get the Treasury into a more prominent position than it occupied in the Bill. He hoped that before the House finally parted with the Bill more information would be given on that point. It was really impossible to come to any conclusion as to how far the control of the House was weakened until they had an opportunity of seeing the Estimates in the form they were to take. He understood from an Answer given by the right hon. Gentleman that the expenditure was to be a matter between the Army Council and the County Associations. He did not very much care how the Army Council got their information from the County Associations. What he wanted to know before the Bill passed was how the Estimates for the year were to be placed before the House of Commons. Until they really saw the form the Estimates were going to take it was impossible to feel satisfied as to the control which the House was to have. The mere statement that the Government was going to proceed on the same lines as in the case of the Volunteers was to his mind unsatisfactory. When they were making a big new departure, not only in their military organisation, but in the control which the House was to have over the future organisation, he thought they were bound to proceed with the greatest caution. He appealed to the Secretary of State for War to give, if possible, some information which would reassure hon. Members on both sides of the House who at present had considerable doubts as to what were the real intentions of the War Office on this question. Although they might not all be able to agree as to the merits of the scheme, the right hon. Gentleman would do a good service if he would show that the House of Commons control over expenditure would be retained under the Bill.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said the right hon. Member for West Derbyshire had put before the House some reasonable criticisms which might be urged against the proposals of the Secretary of State for War. He hoped that any criticism which he himself had to offer would be useful and helpful to the Government. He would endeavour to strengthen them where they were weak. He thought they were decidedly weak on the question of financial control. The present financial Resolution was not only of first importance but of unusual importance, having regard to the fact that a controversy had been going on for a considerable time between the Army and Parliament on the question of financial control. He thought that the financial control of Parliament was weakened under the provisions of this Bill. That was all the more serious, not only in the light of the controversy to which he referred, but after the statement which the Secretary of State for War made some time ago that he wished to give the military man more freedom from financial control. The right hon. Gentleman wished to give him a free hand as far as possible. He agreed that to a certain extent, perhaps, the present position was not tenable, because there was interference on certain purely military points which should be left to the military man. But he was exceedingly anxious that under this Bill Parliament should retain the control which it had had in the past over the finance of the Army. The finance of the Bill was very much in the nature of a Chinese puzzle, and the reason was that the scheme was based on certain proposals of the Esher Committee which had not been accepted, wisely he thought, in their entirety. The Esher Committee recommended that the County Associations should have complete control of command, training, administration, and finance. The right hon. Gentleman had decided that command and training should be taken away from the County Associations and that finance and administration should remain. He thought the present Resolution raised a much larger question than that — a question of great constitutional importance—because under the Bill, if the Secretary of State so wished, the control of finance and administration was not to be confined to the Territorial Army. Under Clause 2 of the Bill the Secretary of State for War reserved to himself and the King in Council a right to assign to the County Associations control over the finance and administration not only of the Territorial Army but of His Majesty's Military forces. That included the Regulars. To show that it included the Regulars he pointed out that under Clause 1, which was intended to apply only to the Territorial Army, the phrase "military forces other than the Regulars" was adopted. The matter went much further than had been represented by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, because by Clause 2 it was provided that—

> "An association shall have, exercise, and discharge such powers and duties connected with the organisation and administration of His Majesty's military forces as may for the time being be transferred or assigned to it by order of His Majesty signified under hand of a Secretary of State or, subject thereto, by regulations under this Act."

That devolution to the County Associations of the administration and finance of the Regular troops by the Army Council superseded the control of Parliament, and, he submitted, created a situation of great gravity. He came now to the finance of the Territorial Army. And here he might say that the criticisms of the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean were mutually destructive, although they were cheered by hon. Gentlemen opposite. But it did not lie with hon. Gentlemen opposite to make any complaint of want of control, because under the administration of the late Government he could remember when a sum of £10,000,000 was, during the war in South Africa, transferred from one head and spent on another, which enabled the Government of the day to avoid calling a special session of Parliament to vote the money.

The system of finance foreshadowed for the Territorial Army in the different Papers which had been submitted to the House and in the very informing speech of the Financial Secretary to the War Office made the matter much more complicated than the present system. First of all, it was proposed to establish a double system of finance in regard to the Territorial Army running concurrently. The one was to apply to the training of the troops and to be subject to an Army audit. But that only applied to a very small part of the expenditure. The money spent on training the Auxiliary Forces would be much greater in the future than in the past, as all the Volunteers had now the option of going into camp for fifteen days. Last year the sum spent was £336,000 out of a total of £1,700,000, so that the part of the expenditure that was to be subject to the Army audit in future would be a very small proportion of the total sum. The portion of the expenditure that would be under the Army financial control would only apply to fifteen days in the year; while the County Associations would be responsible for the remaining 350 days, and would be exempt from the Army audit or from proper financial control. He submitted that whatever system of financial control was set up it ought to be uniform and should apply to all expenditure. He went further; he would like to see the present system of financial control for the Army made more stringent, rather than relaxed, as it would be under this Bill. What happened last year? The Army Council were asked by the Treasury to give a forecast of what their surplus was likely to be on 22nd March. Seven days before the end of the financial year the Army Council said it would be £690,000. But what was the ascertained result after the close of the financial year? A balance of £1,330,000! He submitted that a system of financial control which could allow such a state of things required to be made more stringent rather than to be relaxed. On the 30th April the Chancellor of the Exchequer arrived at the intermediate figure of £963,000. He submitted that the Bill would slacken financial control, and he certainly deprecated anything in that direction. He agreed with the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean that there were grave doubts whether the Estimates submitted were sufficient. He was so convinced that the main proposition in the Bill to divide our armed forces into two lines was a good one, that he thought it was worth while paying for it; and he did not think anything was to be gained by under-estimating the expenditure. On the Second Reading of the Bill he pointed out that the original Estimate of £2,889,408 would not at all meet the requirements of the case. An addition of £625,000 had now been admitted to be absolutely necessary, making a total of £3,514,408. He understood that the Financial Secretary to the War Office had stated that there was a sum included for the administration charges of the County Associations. He very much doubted whether sufficient provision had been made for the administration of the several units of a battalion if it included the expenses incurred by the County Associations. Under the present system the commanding officer of the Volunteer battalion was personally responsible for the expenditure of his corps. That system was illogical, and ought to be abolished. It placed too much responsibility on one single man; but at the same time be believed that it tended to efficient administration and very careful expenditure of the funds of the corps. Every commanding officer felt in honour bound for the success of his corps, and having regard to his own personal liability to see that the affairs of the corps were most carefully administered. He very much doubted, at the same time, whether the proposal to take the responsibility off the commanding officer and lay it on the County Associations would be of very much advantage. At the present time the books of each battalion were open to inspection. The books of his own battalion had been inspected in detail. By the new proposal the inspection was to be carried out by the County Associations, but there would not be the same direct control if it had to go through the commanding officer to the County Association. His own view was that the County Associations would be a somewhat expensive luxury. There would be a combination of grants-in-aid and of payment by results. That would complicate the situation. He admitted that a good deal might be said for putting the administrative charges for drill halls and ranges on a separate grant; but h s experience on the Public Accounts Committee was that that method would be expensive. In regard to the clothing grants, he quite understood the view of the Secretary for War in framing his estimate. It was not a case of providing a new uniform for every man in the battalion. The right hon. Gentleman only took the annual charge of providing a uniform for 200 men every year for a battalion of 800 men. On that point he thought the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean had pushed his argument too far. The Secretary for War anticipated that he would make a great saving by having the clothing provided through the County Associations; but he was not then providing for a walking out dress. He would put a specific case. In the Infantry Brigade of the City of Edinburgh they had three battalions clothed as a rifle brigade; they had one battalion clothed in the territorial uniform of the district, and another which was a kilted corps. Was the County Association to take in hand the supply of clothing for all those corps or were those corps, as at present, to supply their clothing out of the capitation grant? If the corps were to do the work, he thought the Government were complicating matters by sending money through the County Associations, and he would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether some form of Army accounting could not be adopted by which the accounts of the corps should be checked through the War Office and not through the Associations. Another point was how the grant of pay to the men when in camp was to be paid. As an administrative measure the Government were going to supply County Associations with money and through them it was to filter to the corps. How was that to be done? Were the Government going to hand over to the commanding officer of the district or to the brigadier in camp the money which was necessary for this purpose? He urged the right hon. Gentleman to do something to make the matter more simple. He wished the scheme success and it was in no unfriendly spirit that he offered these criticisms, but he felt that Parliamentary control would be lessened by the present proposals. He wished also to draw attention to Clause 3, Sub-section 3, which provided that money paid to a county association should—

> "be applicable to any of the purposes specified in the approved statements in accordance with which the money has been granted, but not otherwise, except with the written consent of the Army Council."

Were they going to make the Army Council independent of the control of Parliament? That provision, along with the provision in Clause 2, where the Secretary of State took power to place the finance and administration not only of the Territorial Army but of the Regular Forces under the county associations was such that he could only characterise it as an amazing proposal. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to assure them that the whole scheme with regard to financial control would be reconsidered.

MR. HALDANE said the hon. Gentleman had raised a question of great importance which was entitled to consideration, not only because he was a member of the Public Accounts Committee but because he had great experience on these subjects. The Government were not likely to have left out of account the financial principles which were concerned and which arose out of the constitution of the country, but he thought there were points in which they had overdone the tendency to take away responsibility from the soldier. He was perfectly certain that they would have had greater economy in the past if they had consulted the soldier more about how to effect economy. He pointed to this year's Estimates as some evidence that, in recognising that doctrine, they could not be said to have damaged the public finances. At the same time, they had kept to the law. Under the Exchequer and Audit Act, 1866, a broad principle was laid down which was of immense constitutional importance. Mr. Gibson Bowles, who unfortunately was not in the House, but was worthily represented, had written a pamphlet, in which he had dwelt upon the vast constitutional importance of keeping a check over the soldier. He did not require that reminder, his duty being simply to keep to the principle laid down in the

Exchequer and Audit Act that Parliament did not allow money to be paid out excepting under its own control, and through an officer of Parliament, not an officer of any Department. How had that been pursued in the case of the Army? In the case of the Regular troops it had been pursued to an extent which was impossible in the case of the Auxiliary Forces. In the case of the Auxiliary Forces there was appreciated from the beginning the danger that correspondence between the commanding officers and the War Office would smother the battalions with red-tape, and the result was that Parliament always gave, in the case of the Auxiliary Forces, who had a local habitation, a greater latitude than was allowed to the Regular Forces. For instance, the capitation grant was paid to the commanding officer of the battalion. Parliament simply said, "Produce us a certificate that you have a man" [Several HON. MEMBERS: An efficient man.] Well, he would say an efficient man. "Produce us a certificate," Parliament said, "that you have got an efficient man, and then you can spend your capitation grant, and you have very large latitude indeed." He thought that had worked well on the whole. He agreed with the hon. Member for East Edinburgh that the latitude allowed to commanding officers had not been abused. In framing their Bill they had to consider that not only past practice, but principle, made it necessary that they should allow a certain amount of latitude, as had been done in the case of the Volunteers, to those who were responsible for the administration and training of the Territorial Force. They had framed their Bill in such a fashion as recognised that principle, but they had done something more. They had gone a certain length in the direction which the hon. Member for East Edinburgh asked in making the control of Parliament more effective than it was in the case of the Volunteer Force. He would have attached more weight to the criticism of his hon. friend had he not observed that he had an Amendment on the Paper to get rid of the powers of the County Associations: his real objection was to the Associations. He was in favour of the old system, which left to the commanding officer still greater latitude than they proposed to give to the associations.

*MR. McCRAE: I do think the County Associations are quite unnecessary, but I am considering this matter purely from the financial standpoint, given the necessity for the Associations.

MR. HALDANE said he would only say that his hon. friend was not strongly biassed in favour of the Associations. When they came to see how the principle had been applied in the Bill, it was necessary to remember that they took the view, and he thought the majority of the House took the view, that the local association, properly administered, was a useful piece of machinery for the purposes of administering, as distinguished from training, these forces. At present, as was pointed out on the Second Reading, when a Volunteer corps went to war the administration rested with the commanding officer; there was no provision for maintaining them from their base. It had no administration. Its administration rested entirely with the Commanding Officer. The Government were trying to get the force into a better shape by separating the business of administration from that of command and training. They proposed to hand over the administrative business to the Associations and the command and training to the proper officers. They had borne in mind that Parliament had always insisted upon the principle that very large latitude should be left to the commanding officers of Volunteers. Under Clause 3 of the Bill the Government had adhered to that principle, but they had increased the control of Parliament by insisting that more particulars should be given by the associations than were at present given by the commanding officers of Volunteers. In the paper which had been circulated in answer to the question—how did they propose to carry out the finance?—it did not represent a formal Estimate—it would be seen that the Government took three possible ways into consideration. They had rejected the lump sum plan and the present Volunteer system of capitation allowance; and they had adopted a modification of the Volunteer system which would give them a much better and more stringent system than existed at the present time. They proposed to ask for the certificate of the general and of the brigadier also as to the efficiency of the units and of the men who composed them. That condition would produce greater stringency than existed under the present system. They had adopted a system which, he thought, was much more intelligent than the present one, because it was based upon the production of results, on the efficiency of the corps and the men comprising them, whereas under the present system they gave the capitation grant and allowed unlimited latitude as to how it was to be applied. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had invited another place to make alterations in the Bill which would produce what he considered very material results. In that other place there were very eminent military authorities, and no doubt they would give the Bill thoroughly impartial consideration. But it was not very helpful to invite them to make changes unless they were prepared to go a great deal more into detail than his right hon. friend had done. His right hon. friend had taken exception to what he had called the want of the same financial control as there was in the case of the Regular Army. Did he really mean that they were to repeal the principle, on which Parliament had proceeded for years, of leaving a certain latitude to the Volunteers? If that was so, he thought that had been answered by the hon. Member for East Edinburgh.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked whether the latitude was to be left to the commanding officers or to the County Associations. Was the money to be received and spent by the County Associations or by the commanding officers? He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that the whole of the money was to be paid by the County Association and accounted for by it.

MR. HALDANE said that was not quite so. The money was divided into two parts, and if the right hon. Gentleman looked at the section he would see that if they wanted an establishment grant that would be paid by the County Association. But a capitation grant would be paid by the colonel of the force, but they would not take a certificate except from the County Associations.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that was not quite his point. His point was not as to who would give the certificates, but who was going to receive and spend the money. The right hon. Gentleman had said the money was to be received and spent by the County Association, but in answer to the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean he said he had no real wish that the colonel commanding the regiment should not have the same power as before. He therefore asked whether the colonel commanding would have the same power of spending money.

MR. HALDANE said that all the money was to be paid to the associations, and the associations would spend the money. The associations would have to produce the certificates. No doubt, when they got far enough down, the colonel of the corps must to some extent handle the money, but he would be accountable to the association, and the association would have to account for him. They substituted the associations for the old commanding officers. In that way they introduced a much more searching system of financial control than now existed, because they would call for certificates from independent generals and brigadiers as to the efficiency of the unit. Their purpose had been to introduce a system of finance which would be more stringent, but would adhere to the principle of leaving latitude to the local administration. The right hon. baronet had referred to doleful instances of things that had come to light under the searching investigation of the Public Accounts Committee. But they would come to light still more readily under the Government's system, because there would be a much more efficient check. It had been said that enough money had not been taken for adjutants. At the present time there were twenty or thirty Volunteer battalions who had adjutants of a voluntary character, and he hoped that system would grow. But he supposed that there would be about 280 adjutants at the outside.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: That is not the present number.

MR. HALDANE said he was not dealing with the present system. He was referring to the number of adjutants there would be in this force of 300,000 men.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman proposed to break up a large number of the existing units. Would he say how many units would be established in the new Territorial Army?

MR. HALDANE said the whole of the figures were given in the estimates.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE asked whether it was proposed at once to get rid of a large number of battalions in order to reduce the number of units in the way suggested in the Estimates.

MR. HALDANE said his hon. friend the Financial Secretary had aleady explained that there must be a transition period. As the existing force diminished, the other would grow, and that process would be worked out gradually and must occupy some time. The number of adjutants they should require was 280. and he had the details which he could give if it was thought necessary. It was perhaps enough to say that having given that figure, any Member of the House could make his own calculations. As regarded the camp allowance, later in the debate his hon. friend, who had great experience in these matters, would make a statement. As regarded the allowances for food and other matters the calculations had been made, not by members of the Army Council merely, not by soldiers who did not understand the Volunteers, but by the most skilled Volunteer officers who worked out their calculations on the best information they could get. The House might take it from him that the accounts had been arrived at, not with any intention of concealing anything, not not with any intention of putting forward estimates which would afterwards have to be exceeded, but upon the footing that they were endeavouring to put before the House a fair answer to the question, "What is the largest sum you are likely to spend?" and they had taken the estimate upon a war footing. That had been complained of, but they would have had a great deal more complaint if they had taken it on a peace footing.

*MR. McCRAE said the right hon. Gentleman had not answered the question as to extending to the County Associations financial and administrative control over the Regular forces.

MR. HALDANE said the expenses of the associations and other matters would be purely incidental. If the associations were asked to undertake regular military duties the financial system would have to be extended. The question of the bounties did not come into this Resolution at all.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he would like to ask hon. Gentlemen who had listened to the debate and the explanations of the Government whether they really understood what financial control the House of Commons would be able to exercise in future. Were the printed explanations really worth the paper they were printed on? What Parliamentary control would there be in future over this very important and growing part of our military expenditure? The Secretary of State assumed that, if he applied to the Territorial Army the same system of finance that had been in the past applied to the Volunteers, he would not be open to criticism. But he must remember that the new Territorial Army was going to be something altogether different from the old Volunteers. In the first place, the Territorial Army was to include a considerable portion of the old Militia, and the audit of the accounts of the old Militia had always been on the strictest Army basis, and was not subject to the exceptions and limitations which applied to the Volunteers. The War Secretary said, "You must allow the commanding officers of Volunteer units considerable latitude, and if you attempt to exercise over them the kind of control that you exercise over the finances of the Regular Army, you will make the working of this scheme impossible." But it now appeared that the latitude was not to be allowed to the commanding officers, but to the County Associations, and all the correspondence which might have gone on between the commanding officers and the War Office, would now have to go on between the commanding officers and the associations. Parliament therefore, would, have no control to see that the money it voted was expended on the objects for which it was voted.

The Financial Secretary had sat for many years on the Public Accounts Committee, and it had been his pleasure to sit with him for a short time on that body. He wondered what the hon. Gentleman thought of the finance of this Army scheme. He had written a memorandum, he had made a speech, but he had not given them his opinion. He would be surprised if the hon. Gentleman, whose intervention in the debates in behalf of financial control had not been infrequent, and whose opinions were on record, approved of the system proposed to be established under this Bill. What was to happen? He did not speak of payments for training. They, he understood, would be added in some way to the expenses of the Regular Forces. That was perfectly satisfactory, and was a change of importance, as the hon. Gentleman had rightly said. He was not dealing with that or criticising it. He was speaking only of the money to be paid to the County Associations. He ventured to say that Parliament would have no control over that expenditure, and would not be able to say whether it had been devoted to the purposes for which it had been voted. The money would be audited, no doubt; but the Parliamentary audit to which they attached importance was not merely an audit which showed that there were vouchers for every item of expenditure, but it was an audit which showed that the money had gone to the objects for which Parliament had voted it. That they would not see under this Bill. There was no provision for it. What was the position under Clause 3? It was that the association should submit to the Army Council its statement of necessary requirements, and all the payments by the Army Council to the association were to be made on the basis of the statement of requirements in so far as they were approved by the Army Council. Then Sub-section 3, which the right hon. Gentleman said was very stringent in its terms, and which he pointed to as setting up a special safeguard, said—

> "All money so paid to an association shall, subject to regulations under this Act, be applicable to any of the purposes specified in the approved statements in accordance with which the money has been granted, but not otherwise except with the written consent of the Army Council."

In the first place let him observe that the money might be spent "otherwise," provided the Army Council gave its written consent, without Parliament knowing anything whatever about it. Where was the Parliamentary control? The Financial Secretary had given them some idea of the form. They would pay the allowance per efficient man, for instance, to the County Association. The estimate was based on the assumption that they had so many Yeomanry and so many Infantry within the county. What control had Parliament to see that the money went to the Infantry or to the Yeomanry? Why could not the County Association take the money voted for the Infantry and apply it to the Yeomanry, or take the money voted for the Yeomanry and apply it to the Infantry? The County Association might spend the money for any purpose specified in an approved statement. They did not need any regulations: the Bill said that the County Association might devote the money paid to them to any of the purposes approved by the Army Council; Parliament had no control, and even if there were regulations, Parliament would have no control over those regulations. The money which Parliament intended for Infantry might be spent on Yeomanry, or *vice versa*. Suppose there were three specific purposes, and a sum of money was allotted in respect of each. There was no reason why the association should not spend the whole of the money on one of those purposes, and neglect the other two. As the Bill stood, he did not think that even the consent of the Army Council was necessary; but without consent the association might do exactly what they pleased with the money.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.) pointed out that all the money paid to the County Associations was subject to the regulations under the Act, and those regulations were subject to the consent of the Treasury.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he could not agree with that reading of the Bill. As the clause stood no regulations were necessary, and the associations could do as he had stated. With the consent of the Army Council these associations could do exactly what they pleased with the money which Parliament voted. Parliament would have voted the money, the associations would proceed to spend it, and the control of Parliament would be gone. What audit would there be of these funds? The right hon. Gentleman had stated that they could not have a stricter audit than they had at present, but he did not think the present control was at all satisfactory. The Reports of the Public Accounts Committee showed that there had been misappropriations—he meant, of course, honest misappropriations—of money which Parliament had voted. But that was not all. Was the present system satisfactory from the point of view of the Volunteers? He had had to bring before the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the case of the commanding officer of a Worcestershire battalion who had been surcharged for the first time for a particular expenditure on behalf of his battalion, and he had been made personally liable for it. He had appealed to the Secretary for War to relieve him of that charge. Under the present system they exercised a spasmodic, irregular, and arbitrary control, and that was not good for the Volunteers or for the maintenance of the control of Parliament over expenditure. He contended that if Parliament was to have any control over expenditure they must appropriate the money within certain limits to particular objects and guard against its transference from one object to another. With regard to the form of the Votes, the accepted rule of procedure was that if any serious change was contemplated the approval of the Public Accounts Committee should be obtained before the Vote was presented to Parliament. He understood the Secretary for War to say that that would be done in this case.

MR. HALDANE assented.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for that admission. Might he suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should go a little further? What they all wanted to know in regard to the Territorial Army was what it would cost when it was in working order. Could they not have the whole cost of the Territorial Army put into one Vote? Hitherto the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers had been put into one Vote, but the right hon. Gentleman excluded stores, artillery, ammunition, and things of that kind, which had hitherto been charged on other Votes, and he did not propose to include them in the Vote for the Territorial Army. He knew that that was done with a desire to give the House the fullest possible information, but he was convinced that the very trouble that had been taken to inform the House often only succeeded in misleading it. In the case of the Somaliland Expedition, for instance, there was every desire to give the House all information, but owing to the way the Estimates were cast, the Government never could give the House an estimate of the actual cost of that expedition by itself. He thought that was most unsatisfactory, and he therefore invited the right hon. Gentleman to consider the possibility of collecting the whole cost of the Territorial Army into the same Vote. He wished also to say a word or two about the Estimates. The right hon. Gentleman wanted to tell them what the cost of the new Territorial Army would be, and he had given an estimate of the running cost, but he had given no estimate of the initial cost. He did not know whether hon. Members realised the kind of capital expenditure involved in the organisation of the Army. He was quite certain that if this scheme was to be made effective, involving as it did a much more extensive use of depots, very large capital expenditure must be incurred. And what was going to be the position in regard to the Volunteer drill-halls? Would they all be handed over free, or would the debt due upon them be considered a charge on future capitation grants? He understood that when they robbed the old sinking fund they did so in order to wipe out the Volunteer debts, and in order that in future there should be no such debts. They were now told that new drill-halls could not be built for the new Territorial Army by the Government, althought they might make grants for that purpose through the County Associations. That reply had left the whole question in a state of confusion. If the taking over of the debts on the drill-halls was not done with the object of freeing them from debt, what was the object? Why should they now restart the system of borrowing money where new drill-halls were required? He confessed that even after what had been said by the Secretary of State for

War he retained his scepticism as to the value of the estimates which had been given. He did not believe it would be possible to work the scheme even for the services at present contemplated within the limits of the estimated expenditure. He was quite certain that if they were going to have a territorial system the amount of money which they would have to spend was in no way fully indicated by the Estimates. In regard to depots and drill-halls he pressed particularly for an answer. In the matter of depots, the right hon. Gentleman in the early stage might be able to scrape along, though they were at present inconvenient and insufficient, but the expenditure on new depots would grow just in proportion as the scheme proceeded and succeeded, and thereby a great capital obligation would be incurred for which the right hon. Gentleman had made no provision, and which he was leaving others to provide when they came after him.

MR. HALDANE was understood to say that the depots would be for the third battalions.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked whether the depots, in view of what had been said by the Inspector-General of Recruiting, provided proper accommodation for the third battalions. Was it the kind of accommodation which would make the third battalions respect themselves, and respected in the eyes of the nation? Another point to which he wished to direct attention had been referred to by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, but it had not been touched upon by the Financial Secretary. The Secretary of State for War definitely pledged himself last night that the position of the Yeomanry should be substantially as comfortable under the new scheme as it had been in the past. The right hon. Gentleman said he meant to have only one standard of comfort in future, and that standard must be the 5s. 6d. standard of the Yeomanry. He had indicated that he could do it more cheaply, but it was to be the 5s. 6d. standard. The right hon. Gentleman might be successful in getting 5s. 6d. worth for 4s., but that meant a great levelling up for which he saw no provision made. That was one of many points at which he believed the scheme would break down. The only chance for the financial prophecies not proving false would be that the Territorial Army should never come into existence.

*MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) said he was very much disturbed by the line the debate had taken in regard to the financing of the Territorial Army, and hoped some clearer assurances would be given to the House by the right hon. Gentleman than it had yet received that there would be no lowering of the Parliamentary control over the finance. He confessed that the Secretary of State for War had not made that satisfactory to his mind yet. It seemed to him that there would be large sums paid out over which Parliament would have no control at all—he meant sums other than those which were being paid out now under the head of the Volunteer Force. If Parliament was justified in one thing more than another, it was in protesting against any withdrawal of its right to control the finances of the different Departments. He felt doubt on this subject on account of a remark which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman. He understood him to say that if more confidence had been placed in the military authorities, and if they had not been supervised quite so much in the past, there would have been greater economy.

MR. HALDANE said he had saved at least £1,000,000 this year by adopting that plan, and the control of Parliament was as great as ever.

*MR. GODDARD said he was not disputing that fact. The right hon. Gentleman had suggested that that might be carried out to a much greater degree than at present, and that if the military men had more liberty greater economy could be effected. He was very doubtful about that himself. As a member of the Public Accounts Committee of long standing he did not think that that statement was justified by experience. Cases had constantly come under the observation of that Committee which did not seem to warrant the suggestion that there would be greater economy if there was less observation and less control by the Audit Department. More control and not less was wanted than at present. It appeared to him that under the financial arrangements of the Bill there was an exaggerated amount of *virement*—the power of transferring money voted for one purpose to another purpose with the sanction of the Treasury. Up to the present time that form of transfer could only be done with the sanction of the Treasury, but under the financial proposals of the Bill the same power was given to the Army Council. Personally he had always said that he had great doubts as to the value of the principle of *virement*. It involved one of those practices which he had always considered dangerous, and it seemed to him most undesirable to extend the principle.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said it was a great comfort to him that such financial authorities as the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and the hon. Member for East Edinburgh had as much doubt about the financial arrangements of the Bill as he had himself. He had endeavoured to follow the speeches of the Secretary of State for War, and he had read the numerous Papers which had been issued, but he had not been able to make head or tail of the finance of the scheme. In taking that view of what the hon. Member for East Edinburgh called a Chinese puzzle he felt that he was in extremely good company. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that the best course would be to withdraw the Bill. As a practical man he must recognise that they were wasting their time to a considerable extent. The constitution of the County Associations had not been discussed, and the scheme was being forced through by the guillotine. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had said that it was quite impossible to think that the Bill could pass in its present form. If the view that the Bill should be withdrawn did not commend itself to the right hon. Gentleman, he would like more enlightenment as to the finance of the measure. The scheme had been launched with promises of economy on the present system, which cost £4,500,000. The new scheme was to cost £2,800,000, but already an approximate estimate showed that there were additions of about £625,000. Anyone who analysed this additional cost to the estimates would arrive at the conclusion so clearly stated by two hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House, that the amount had been under-estimated to a very considerable extent. The camp allowance and the supplement for rations and staff was put at £170,000; but was it possible that after the declarations and undertakings of the Secretary of State as to the comfort that was to be provided for the Territorial Army—including the Volunteers, Yeomanry and Militia—that anything like £170,000 would be adequate for that purpose? As to the adjutants for the Territorial Forces, he was exceedingly glad and grateful that the Secretary of State had given way on that point. His conviction was that the withdrawal of the adjutants provided by the Regular Army would have been the greatest blow that could be imagined for the Auxiliary Forces. But he very much doubted whether the amount allotted for the adjutants, £140,000, was anything like sufficient. The original estimate was £210,000 for the units of cavalry and infantry; but nothing was said as to artillery and engineers; and greater importance was now attached to field artillery than even to cavalry and infantry. The House would notice a very serious statement made by the right hon. Gentleman in referring to this matter that day. The right hon. Gentleman said in effect that the present units would be no guide to the number of units of the Territorial Force. That meant that all the past expense and labour incurred by commanding officers in providing drill halls, ranges, and exercise grounds would be thrown away, while many of the units would be disbanded, or amalgamated with others. At the least, the lessening of the responsibility of commanding officers would seriously damage the efficiency of what was now the Volunteer Force. If the right hon. Gentleman had consulted commanding officers all over the country he would have found that there was nothing more advantageous to the Volunteer Force than the responsibility of the commanding officers; and if that responsibility was to be transferred to the County Associations a very different state of things would soon prevail. No provision was made for an adequate staff of sergeant-instructors necessary for training. He had endeavoured to obtain an assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that the sergeant-instructors would be retained, but he had got no satisfactory answer.

He maintained that the new scheme could not be made to work unless a full and ample proportion of sergeant-instructors was given to each battalion. As to the uniforms, under the original plan it was only proposed to give one field-service dress; but not only was an out-walking dress required, but a brigade dress; and it was impossible to suppose that the Territorial Army would be content with less. There were many other items which the right hon. Gentleman had neglected to take into account, as to which, he thought, Parliament ought to be informed before it passed the Bill. For instance, was the pay of fourteen divisional generals to be charged to the Territorial Army?

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that if the hon. and gallant Gentleman looked at the Paper 3,296, page 5, and at the first two columns at the left hand he would find the information.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said he did not see anything there about fourteen divisional generals. It was just possible that the Under-Secretary for India, having sufficient leisure, had been able to evolve that, but he had not been able to find it.

MR. HALDANE said the hon. and gallant Gentleman might take it from him that the full salary of a major-general for each division was provided for in the Estimates.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT said he was much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for his explanation. He complained further as to the absence of details in regard to rations and equipments and said there was nothing in the Estimates in regard to capital expenditure for drill halls, ranges, and exercise grounds. There was no doubt that much pressure would be brought to bear on the War Office and the Secretary of State to enlarge the Estimates to an enormous extent to carry the scheme through.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he was sure that no one present would grudge in any way the time spent on this important discussion; and he could assure the House that there was no reluctance on the part of the occupants of the Treasury Bench to give information to the House which would enable it to exercise its chief function of controlling expenditure. He thought the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean sometimes devoted his manifold talents to scaring his own friends somewhat unnecessarily, and that he had done so on this occasion. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the provision for clothing was ridiculously under-estimated; and the House would pardon him if he went somewhat fully into the details of that particular item. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to what he apparently believed to be inconsistent Answers given by the Secretary of State for War to Questions put during the present session. The Answers were all correct, but they showed the difficulty of dealing with particular items apart from the general scheme. The scheme must be considered as a whole, and they must have perfectly clear in their own minds what uniforms they were going to give to the Territorial Force and what they were going to pay for that purpose. It was proposed to give two suits of uniform to every one of the 160,000 men of the infantry branch of the Territorial Army to start with. The first uniform, known as the service dress, would cost 66s. 10d., and that included jacket, trousers, putties, cap, and great-coat. It did not include the cost of a pair of boots, but the cost of soleing a pair of boots, the reason being that as the Territorial soldier would only come out for fourteen days training it could not be expected that the State should provide him with a pair of boots; but it was reasonable that the pair of boots he used in civil life should be re-soled at the cost of the State. For the second suit there was an allowance of 30s. The cost of providing uniforms for each man was, therefore, £4 16s. 10d., and the total estimated expenditure for the 160,000 men was £780,000.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Whose estimate is it? Whitechapel's or the Army Clothing Department's?

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said it was the estimate of the Army Clothing Department, and from his own experience he thought it could be done a great deal cheaper.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Sweating!

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that £720,000 was provided in the Estimate for clothing, or £60,000 less than the apparent cost of £780,000. The deficit was explained by the fact that some of the articles—belts for instance—would not need renewing during the four years of service. It was said that the provision of £140,000 a year for the Regular adjutants for the Territorial Force was an under-estimate of the cost. On the contrary, after providing for 280 adjutants at £420 each, it would leave £20,000 for unforeseen contingencies. But a much more important point was the control which was to be exercised by the House over the expenditure of the money provided for the Territorial Force. He recognised the overwhelming importance of the full control of expenditure by the House; and if he thought there was any lowering of that control under the Bill he would not be there advocating it. The words of Clause 3 were clear on that point They provided that the County Association could not vary the application of the money paid to them, even though they had the written consent of the Army Council, without the approval of the Treasury. The words of the Bill were—

> "All money so paid to an association shall, subject to regulations under this Act, be applicable to any of the purposes specified on the approved statements in accordance with which the money has been granted, but not otherwise except with the written consent of the Army Council."

If the words which it was proposed to leave out were omitted the County Associations could spend money on the various objects for which it was voted without any consent of the Army Council, but the moment they put in the words—

> "Subject to the regulations of this Act,"

which brought in the Treasury, they would realise that they could not vary the application of the money. He had often from the opposite side of the House been as jealous as any hon. Gentleman opposite that the expenditure put at the disposal of the Departments of State should be fully known, and as fully under the control of the House as possible. He believed the words to which he had drawn attention met all proper requirements of the House. He believed they met every objection put forward by the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire, and all he could say was that even if the right hon. Gentleman's most stringent conditions were not observed it was unquestionable that the control over the new Territorial Force would be infinitely greater than the present control over the commanding officers of the Volunteer Force. He had endeavoured to make clear those two most important points, and trusted he had succeeded. The right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the transfer of depots and of the maintenance of drill halls. The right hon. Gentlemen would remember that at the beginning of this year the Government took £500,000, which enabled them to take over from the Loans Commissioners the mortgages of the drill halls. If those drill halls came under the control of the County Associations the mortgages would be wiped off, which would give the drill halls to them free of debt, and out of the funds placed at their disposal they would have to maintain those drill halls just in the same way as some economical —and he used the word advisedly—Volunteer corps managed to maintain their drill halls out of the money they derived from the State. The right hon. Gentleman would understand that the depots did not come within the Territorial Forces at all. They were outside because they were raised for the purpose of training battalions. He hoped he had made these matters clear and that the House would now come to a decision.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he was very much puzzled with regard to certain points connected with the financial position of the County Associations, and, therefore, desired to put one or two propositions to the right hon. Gentleman who might signify his assent, or dissent, by a motion of his head. In the first place, he understood that these County Associations were to have nothing to do with the settlement of the pay and emoluments of the officers and men of the Territorial Force. Was that so?

*MR. SPEAKER said that that was the time to make speeches and not to cross-examine Ministers.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said he had only put it in that way to save time. It was a very important point, because it touched the financial portion of the scheme. He hoped it was true that the County Associations would have no control over the Regular Forces until some fresh development took place. He hoped it was also true that they would have nothing to do with discipline, and that it would be absolutely out of the power of any County Association in any sense whatever to send the hat round for any expenditure on behalf of the force. If that were so, the County Associations would draw every penny of income which they administered through the Army Council, and with the consent of the Army Council, and he understood the Army Council would have to go through and assent to every item of the expenditure. He therefore assumed that the Army Council was really acting under the responsibility of the Secretary of State for War.

MR. HALDANE said he was unable to put it so shortly. The Secretary of State was only a member of the Army Council, but in another way he was responsible to Parliament, and in that sense no doubt he would control the Army Council.

*MR. SPEAKER pointed out that the right hon. and gallant Member could now only deal with the financial question and not with the general objects of the Bill.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said the powers of the County Associations seemed to touch the financial question more closely than the Government were willing to allow. He understood that the County Associations were to be empowered to put out contracts for the supply of the different necessities for the Territorial soldiers in their jurisdiction, and for drill halls and rifle ranges, but he did not understand what security they had to give to the contractors. They had no capital moneys of their own and he did not know whose credit they had to pledge.

MR. HALDANE said the Loans Commissioners.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY asked whether that was sufficient.

MR. HALDANE said it could not, under the clause in the Bill, be done without the assent of the Army Council.

*MR. SPEAKER reminded the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that that was the time to make speeches, and not to ask questions. He also reminded him that the House was now discussing the financial Resolution; that the position of the County Associations was not now before the House. This Resolution referred to the provision and payment of money to be devoted by Parliament to the Territorial Forces.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY expressed his regret that he should have contravened the rules of order. He would pass from the County Associations and allude to a question with which he had been closely concerned, namely, that which arose at the end of the debate on the previous evening on the question of camp allowance. He desired to put forward what he understood to be the pledged position of the right hon. Gentleman. He understood from the right hon. Gentleman that the cavalry of the Territorial Army when in camp would not suffer in their substantial comforts through any reduction of pay. He would not, he thought, be far wrong when he put the difference in the cost of those substantial comforts at 3s. per man, and on that estimate, on the territorial cavalry, which was to be 50,000, the right hon. Gentleman would have to spend £7,000. If the right hon. Gentleman had to give those substantial comforts to the remaining 250,000 of the Territorial Force, to carry out his pledge he would have to spend £37,500.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he did not think that the speeches of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean and of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh had yet received a reply. There was the question of the ordinary service dress. The Under-Secretary for India had told them that the cost of the new dress for the Infantry, including great coat, helmet, &c., would be 66s. 10d., and that 9d. would be given as boot allowance. The right hon. Gentleman, when asked a question on the 8th April by the hon. Member for Darlington, stated that the cost of the new suit, including great coat, helmet, cap, putties, &c., would be £2 17s. 3d. The right hon. Gentleman's colleague had just said that it would cost 66s. 10d.

MR. HALDANE: For both suits.

LORD BALCARRES said he certainly had not understood that it was for both suits, but only for the new service dress. In the revised Estimate the cost of the walking-out dress was £113,000 for 300,000 men. That worked out at 7s. per walking-out dress, which was an absurd sum. He appealed to hon. Members whether 7s. for a walking-out dress for any member of a Volunteer Force was not a perfectly grotesque figure. The upkeep of the Service dress was an annual expense. What was the capital cost going to be? Why was it not put into the Estimate?

MR. HALDANE: It is not wanted.

LORD BALCARRES said they had settled to amalgamate the forces in the next four years. Every article of costume, barring belts and, perhaps, haversacks, would have to be replaced, and that would mean a large capital outlay. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to give 300,000 men a walking-out dress which would cost 7s. per man. Everybody knew that the walking-out dress of a Volunteer up to the present had cost anything from £2 up to four guineas. It was not the fault of the Secretary of State that he could not explain the matter. It was utterly misleading to put in the Estimate that they were going to supply 300,000 men with a walking-out dress that was to cost 7s. per man. The Estimate would have to be revised. They had already had a second edition of it, and the sooner they got a third edition the better able they would be to ascertain what was likely to be the approximate cost. The right hon. Gentleman had omitted to answer the question of the hon. Member opposite who wanted to know what the parade dress was going to be. That was an important point with a direct financial bearing. The right hon. Gentleman had announced that night, for the first time, although many questions had been previously asked, that the number of Infantry battalions in the new territorial scheme was to be 168. That involved the disbandment of scores of existing Volunteer regiments. Suppose they had, in a given area, five battalions, two of which were strong, and three required to be disbanded. Was the right hon. Gentleman going to merge those men, with different uniforms, into the new battalion? If that was done, it would make the corps ridiculous. The right hon. Gentleman ought to tell them frankly what he meant to do on this question. There were two items which the right hon. Gentleman said did not come within the scope of the Resolution. The first item was the depots, and the second was the bounties. The outlay which would be necessary on the depots in the next five or six years would perhaps amount to millions of money. Many of the depots were in an insanitary condition and badly constructed. They would have to be put right, and some would have to be rebuilt substantially, owing to the requirements of the Territorial Force. That was a great outlay, for which this measure was directly responsible. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Resolution did not cover the bounties. He did not deny that, but it provided for all the expenses of raising and maintaining the Territorial Force. He had always understood that the bounties would come within this provision; he now understood they did not. They had always been told that the fundamental principle of the Bill was to make two lines—the Territorial Army and the Regular Army. The persons to whom the bounties were to be paid were boys of seventeen or eighteen years of age, who would certainly not be members of the Regular Army, and, if they were not members of the Territorial Army, then the scheme between the two Lines broke down. They had 60,000 or 70,000 persons to whom they had to pay bounties, but who were neither in the Territorial Force, nor members of the Regular Army. Although that might not affect the finance with which they were now concerned, it had a remarkable bearing on the general statement of the Secretary of State. And what about the storage of equipments? They were told that day for the first time that an immense number of the battalions were to be disbanded. He dared say that might be right, but it would have a decided financial effect on the question of storage of equipments. At the present moment small battalions had small store houses for rifles, and so on. If they disbanded those small battalions, as would occur very likely in a country town, they risked not getting recruits in future for the Territorial Force. During the last dozen years there had been Volunteer Corps disbanded for inefficiency, or some other reason, but if the right hon. Gentleman cared to inquire of those concerned, he would find that such was the bitterness of feeling in those places where the regiments had been disbanded, that, ever since, it had been impossible to obtain any recruits for new corps. Besides causing bitterness and heartburning by disbanding the corps, they would have to take over the small store houses, while in the large towns they would have to make the store houses bigger. That was a substantial outlay, for which the right hon. Gentleman had made no provision whatever. They had heard three speeches from the Treasury Bench. He thought it would have been courteous to the supporters of the Government if some reply had been given to their criticisms as to the levelling up of the standard of the territorial infantry to that now prevailing in the Yeomanry. It was a big subject, and if the right hon. Gentleman carried out his pledge it would cost a great deal of money. The standard of comfort, whatever its costs, now prevailing in the Yeomanry, would be in future the standard of comfort for the infantry of the Territorial Force. Did the right hon. Gentleman mean by that the standard of the mess ? He presumed that he did, because that was one of the elements of the measure of comfort. Then another standard was the number of men accommodated per camp. If inquiries were made, it would be found that the space allotted in each camp for the Militia or Volunteers was considerably smaller than that usually allotted to the Yeomanry, and the tent accommodation must be enormously enlarged in consequence. That was another thing omitted from the Estimate. In the original scheme there was an extraordinary provision, which he thought a very dangerous one, that only 50 per cent. of the sergeants and those below sergeant's rank were to have separation allowance when in camp. That could not stand. If they picked out one half of the sergeants and corporals for separation allowance they would create an impossible state of things. They could not penalise men in that way ; they could not make separation allowance a good conduct badge. In the case of two men, both long service men, both married, they had to choose between those two to whom they would give the separation allowance. Such a proceeding would inflict incalculable damage on the *morale* of the corps, and the right hon. Gentleman must make up his mind either to take away the separation allowance altogether, or to give it to all those who, under given conditions, would be entitled to receive it. There was no provision for rifle clubs or rifle ranges. A rifle range had to be near to the village in which the members of the club lived, and it was a very difficult thing to provide even a miniature range. The Government had made no provision for that at all. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman cordially for having put £140,000 down for Regular Adjutants. That item in itself meant the efficiency of thousands of men. He wished to know if that £140,000 was the only item involved. In the original scheme the right hon. Gentleman told them that the idle solicitor would be able to do the Adjutant's work, and he contemplated withdrawing all the Regular Adjutants and adding them to the Regular Army so as to reduce the shortage of officers. He now proposed to preserve largely the efficiency of the Volunteers by maintaining the professional Adjutant, but the shortage of officers for the Regular Army remained. That shortage had to be made good ; it would involve a fresh charge upon the Army funds, and he would like to know the cost of that item. There were two more omissions in regard to rifles and guns. The House were aware that the rifles were being converted, and this year one-seventh of the rifles to be used by the Territorial Force were being converted. If the right hon. Gentleman meant to convert all these rifles before they became obsolete, he would have to spend a great deal of money during the next financial year. He hoped he was not going to take seven years to accomplish that. Therefore he would probably have to provide for another five-sevenths or six-sevenths of the total cost of conversion next year, and that was totally unprovided for. The same with the guns. The artillery Volunteers were to be armed with the fifteen-pounders, and that gun had also to be converted, and only £10,000 was provided for the purpose. That would only convert thirty-six guns, and 400 would remain to be dealt with. Consequently less than 10 per cent. of the total guns would be converted this year. It was ridiculous to suppose that they were going to take ten years for the conversion of those guns; therefore he assumed that during the next financial year they would have to provide £90,000 to convert the rest. There were other serious omissions from the revised Estimate, such as the bad accommodation in the depots and provision for bounties. There was no reference to storage for equipment, camp and separation allowances, rifle clubs and ranges, the extra cost for officers caused by retaining the adjutants, and service and walking out dress. He would not go into the matter of control because that had been dealt with by previous speakers who had shown the gravity of the position. The distinction between audit and appropriation had not been clearly explained. Even the audit presented very grave difficulties. No rough and ready line could be drawn between administrative expenses and those incurred in camp. The control of the House of Commons over the accounts would be lost. In regard to the Yeomanry, every speaker had gone against the scheme, but they could not expect the Government to give way although, in his opinion, the Government ought to do so. The right hon. Gentleman was asked at Question time if he would submit the form of accounts to the Public Accounts Committee and had given a point-blank refusal.

MR. BUCHANAN said his right hon. friend was asked if he would refer to the Public Accounts Committee the Statement of Requirements recently issued, and he replied that that Paper was only a suggested form to help the discussion of this Bill. He stated that when the Bill had become law and the Estimates had been framed his Estimate would be submitted to the Public Accounts Committee.

LORD BALCARRES said he was glad to hear that statement, and he hoped the Public Accounts Committee would make a recommendation as to the laying of the rules before Parliament and as to the surrender of surpluses, to which no reference had been made. Whatever course was taken the control of Parliament could not be complete until the House of Commons had the right to discuss the rules. Unless the House of Commons was given an opportunity of understanding the real proposals of the Government and the cost involved he ventured to say that the confusion and chaos of the finance of this Army scheme would be considerably increased.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 212; Noes, 82. (Division List No. 188.)

## AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Som'rset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duckworth, James
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.

Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry

Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Philipps, J. Winford (Pembroke
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'h
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.

Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, S. E.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J.W.H.(Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baring, Capt. Hn. G(Winchester)
Barnes, G. N.
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A.(Worc.
Clynes, J. R.
Cochrane Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J.(Birmingham

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Captain James(Down, E.
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hervey, F. W. F.(Bury S. Edm'ds
Hodge, John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland

Jowett, F. W.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St. Pancras, E.)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Dublin, S.)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macpherson, J. T.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike(Darlington)
Percy, Earl

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Bowles and Viscount Castlereagh.

## TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid.) in the Chair.]

Clause 3 :

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH moved to leave out the words, "for Army services." He explained that the object of the Amendment was to make it as clear as possible that the money voted by the House of Commons should be applied to the purposes for which they were granted. It appeared to him that under the scheme they were going to have considerable resort to the system of capitation grants, and therefore it was most necessary and desirable that they should have as many particulars as they could get in regard to the sums to be voted. Notwithstanding what had been said in the previous debate the impression still remained on his mind that it was the intention of the Government to ask the House of Commons to vote a large aggregate sum, and out of that to make grants to the various County Associations. He failed to see any necessity for the words which he proposed to omit from the clause. If the obligation was cast upon the Army Council to ask the House to vote several sums of money they must lay definitely before the House their reasons for asking for those sums. He felt certain that the purposes of the Act would be better carried out if Parliament was asked to vote definite sums than if the finance of the County Associations came out of an aggregate sum. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would restrict the action of the Army Council in such a manner as to prevent money voted for one purpose being applied to another. The Amendment, he thought, went some way in compelling the Army Council to state definitely for what purpose the money was required. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 25, to leave out the words 'for Army services.'"—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. BUCHANAN said he did not think the adoption of the Amendment would really further the view which the right hon. Gentleman had in view. The Army Council would have no power over moneys voted by Parliament except those for Army services. As the right hon. Gentleman was well aware, there was no general Vote under the Army Estimates which the authorities at the War Office could use for any general purposes. Possibly the object which the right hon. Gentleman had in view might be made the subject of an Amendment at a later stage, but nothing would be gained by insisting on the Amendment now before the Committee.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) moved to omit the words "in the opinion of the Army Council." He did not think it should rest with the Army Council or any central body to say what should be treated as necessary expenditure in connection with the discharge of the County Associations' duties. It was essentially a matter to be decided upon the spot. He did not mean that the central body should have no control at all, but it was impossible for a central body to decide exactly what was necessary in this or that place or what would be spent here and what would be saved there. Under the present system, as far as the Volunteers were concerned, the expenditure out of public funds was strictly defined, and the result was that in many districts a large sum had to be raised by subscription or else provided by the company officers in order to give the men a training at all and comply with the regulations as to efficiency. If, however, under the right hon. Gentleman's scheme they were going to have a democratic Army, he maintained that that Army should be paid on democratic lines and should not be dependent upon local subscriptions and good will or the generosity of the officers. To illustrate this, let them take a Volunteer company situated in a country district far from the battalion's headquarters. It had to be recruited from seven or eight different hamlets or villages and was served by one rifle range. It might or might not be in a central place, but at any rate it must be a long distance from some squad centres. The picture he was trying to draw was no exaggeration, for his own company was in that position. He had only one rifle range for his men, and in order to train them properly he had to bring them all in to drill. He could not drill them entirely in squads at their homes because for part of their training it was essential that the company should be brought together. It was impossible to expect men, whether they were shop assistants or agricultural labourers, at the end of their day's work to march four or five miles, and in some cases twelve miles, to do two hours drill and then march home again. The Government must provide such men with the means to convey them to and from their homes for drill. It was a necessary expenditure if the men were to be trained at all, but it was an expenditure which had not been recognised in the past, and would not in the future, if the expenditure was to be stereotyped by Army Council regulations. There were many other instances to which the same thing applied. It was quite impossible for the Army Council to appreciate all the difficulties of individual cases. The responsibility of the company officers would remain under the new system as it was now, and that alone would absolutely destroy any democratic principle which the Government wished to apply. He hoped the Government would accept his Amendment, or at least give some satisfactory assurance that the whole of the necessary expenditure would be met by the Treasury, and that officers would in future be freed from the obligation of finding money to train and equip their men. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed :—

"In page 4, line 26, to leave out the words 'in the opinion of the Army Council.'"—(*Mr. Courthope.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. BUCHANAN said that if the Bill passed the association for the county would send in to the Army Council an estimate of the amount of money it would probably want for the various corps under its jurisdiction for travelling and other charges. If the Army Council considered, on investigation, that it was a reasonable amount they would grant it. The object the hon. Member had in view would be attained by the clause as it stood; and it would not be helped in any way by leaving out the words suggested in his Amendment.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that he had given notice of a similar Amendment, but for quite other reasons than those mentioned by his hon. friend. The object he had in view was to secure that, when once the money had been voted, it should be spent, not as the Army Council might think proper, but as the House of Commons had decided it should be spent when it voted the money. What he was afraid of was that if these words were left in, after the money had been voted by Parliament there might be an inclination on the part of the Army Council of the day to spend it possibly in directions other than those already decided upon by Parliament; and therefore he thought that the words were unnecessary.

*Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmorland, Appleby) said he was one of those who had shared the doubt as to how far the scheme of the Bill would meet the requirements of sound financial control; but he was convinced that it was sounder than the scheme proposed by the hon. Member who moved the Amendment. The hon. Member's proposal was, as he understood it, that the local associations should have the last word to say as to the allocation and expenditure of the money voted by Parliament.

He regarded it as of importance that the last word should be with the Army Council, and that was what the words proposed to be left out secured. He therefore would oppose the Amendment. A right hon. Gentleman had come forward with a similar Amendment from the opposite point of view, with which he had the greatest possible sympathy, of maintaining the control of Parliament, but it seemed to him that it would have an effect contrary to what his right hon. friend desired. As the clause stood the County Association would have to justify their claims to the Army Council. The contradictory grounds on which this Amendment had been supported on the other side seemed to him absolutely fatal to it, and he hoped it would be withdrawn.

MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks) did not see why the words "in the opinion of the Army Council" were in the clause at all. As far as he could make out the reason was that it was intended that the views of the Army Council were to prevail over the views of the associations, and the Army Council was to have the last word as to the direction in which the money was to be expended. If these words were expunged, the clause would read perfectly naturally and reasonably as follows :—"The Army Council shall pay to an association, out of money voted by Parliament for Army services, such sums as are required to meet the necessary expenditure connected with the exercise and discharge by the association of its powers and duties," and he could not see that the authority of the Army Council was weakened in any way by the Amendment. He thought the words which it was proposed to omit were redundant and might therefore well be left out.

Question put.

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 200; Noes, 40. (Division List No. 189.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Bell, Richard
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duckworth, James
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A, (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester,
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk Bg'hs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.

*Mr. Leif Jones.*

M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
[redacted]
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

## NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn Sir Alex. F.
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Collings, Rt. Hn J (Birmingham)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North).
Craig, Captain James (Down, E)
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Houston, Robert Paterson
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Macpherson J. T.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morpeth, Viscount
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
[redacted]
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton,
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Courthope and Viscount Castlereagh.

*Viscount VALENTIA (Oxford) said his object in moving to leave out the word "necessary" in order to insert the word "whole," so that the Army Council should pay to the association all the expenditure which it incurred, was to avert two dangers which would be present in the clause if it was left as it was. He felt that it was possible that the clerks in the War Office in examining the accounts sent in by the county associations might take a different view from that which the associations took of the word "necessary." He had had much correspondence with the War Office and knew that it was in the power of a subordinate to say that there was a warrant or an Army order which made it impossible that the item should be allowed. There was a story extant of how a small item involving sixpence led to an enormous amount of correspondence. An officer travelling abroad sent in an account in which the item of "Porter 6d." occurred. The memorandum was sent back with the remark that refreshment was not allowed to officers on this duty, and that sixpence could not be allowed for the "porter" which he claimed. The officer wrote back and said he had not had any refreshment, but the sixpence was spent on the porter who had conveyed his portmanteau from the station to the hotel. He was told that that should be returned as "porterage" and not as "porter," and in reply he pertinently asked whether if he took a cab, he should return the sum paid as "cabbage." There was a danger that these War Office vagaries would be repeated on what was thought to be necessary expenditure by the County Associations. There was the danger also of the Territorial Force being starved for money by the War Office which would be naturally influenced by the old soldiers at the top of the tree who considered that all expenditure was waste which was not expended on the regular forces. It was to avert these dangers that he begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

> "In page 4, line 27, to leave out the word 'necessary,' and to insert the word 'whole.'"—(*Viscount Valentia.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. BUCHANAN was understood to say the words in the clause were sufficient to meet the object the noble Lord had in view. The Secretary of State for War had definitely stated that the Army Council were prepared to bear, out of public funds, all such expenditure for the purpose of maintaining the Territorial Army.

*VISCOUNT VALENTIA: Necessary in the opinion of the Army Council.

MR. BUCHANAN said certainly that must be so. He thought that would be sufficient guarantee for the future. It was essential that the Army Council should have some control over the demands of the County Associations, and hon. Members who had complained that the Government had not kept sufficient control over the expenditure would not grudge this control to the Army Council.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) said he did not think that what had been said met this Amendment, and unless some undertaking such as was suggested by the Amendment were given he was afraid it would come back to the old system of sending the hat round in various parts of the country in order to obtain that equipment which the Army Council thought unnecessary. The local conditions in various parts differed very greatly and what was thought necessary in one district for equipment would not be necessary in another. "Necessary" was a word of great elasticity, and what might be a necessity in the eyes of some might be a luxury in the eyes of others. He thought there should be a statement from the Front Bench to define the meaning of the word "necessary" in this connection. By accepting the Amendment the War Office would only be doing in effect what they had promised in principle, viz., was to bear the whole cost of carrying this scheme into effect. Those who had taken a great interest in the old Yeomanry and other voluntary forces might not care to extend the same patronage to the new Territorial Force, and it seemed to him that if only the bare necessities of the case were met these people might naturally say to themselves that the State having taken over the control entirely they must pay for it. The sources which had hitherto been open to various regiments would be closed, and when these regiments met together some might find themselves at a loss to equip themselves in the manner to which they had been accustomed. He supported the Amendment.

*VISCOUNT VALENTIA after the explanation of the hon. Gentleman opposite asked leave to withdraw the Amendment, but he hoped the Army Council would see that there was no lack of funds for the Territorial Army.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH moved an Amendment to Sub-section 2, providing that the approval of the Treasury as well as the Army Council should be required for the statement of the requirements of an association considered as a basis for payments. He thought that both sides of the House were very nearly in accord with regard to the general view of this question. The point was how far it was carried out by the words of the Bill. This Bill had been very largely drawn as an enabling measure, and they had to deal with regulations which they had not seen and even of the existence of which they did not know. The object of the Amendment was to get it definitely laid down that the expenditure of the county associations was to be approved by the Treasury as well as by the Army Council.

He wished that the Treasury should be alive to the necessity of all these matters being submitted to them by direct order of the House, in order that they might have greater security, both for efficiency and for economy.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 34, at end to insert the words 'and the Treasury.'"—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BUCHANAN said he did not think that the right hon. Gentleman had carefully studied the clause, which he might say was very plain—

"An association shall submit to the Army Council annually at the prescribed time, and may submit at any other time for any special purpose, in the prescribed form and manner, a statement of its necessary requirements, and all payments to an association by the Army Council shall be made upon the basis of such statements as far as they are approved by the Army Council."

That was the preliminary stage in the composition and submission of the Estimate. The War Office, like any other Department, sent their Estimates one by one to the Treasury for approval, and the Treasury made their comments upon the Estimates as a whole, and also upon the items of those Estimates. It was not the practice of the War Office, nor was it demanded by the Treasury, that the former should consult the latter as to any particular item proposed to be put into the Estimate. It would be wholly without precedent, and not demanded by the Treasury, that at this stage the Treasury should be consulted as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the amount of money proposed to be given to the county associations for their purposes. When the whole Estimate was completed in form it was sent over to the Treasury, who wrote back to the Department their comments. They might say that too much was asked on this item, or too little on that, and they would ask the reason of a particular item or charge. It was a perfectly recognised practice, and he did not think that any useful purpose would be served in regard to the work of the Departments if they put upon their discretion the limiting restriction suggested by the Amendment as to the items which should be inserted in the Estimate to be subsequently submitted to the Treasury.

SIR F. BANBURY said he had not quite understood the reason which had actuated the hon. Gentleman in refusing to accept the Amendment of his hon. friend. As far as he understood, when the Estimate was first made, it was sent to the Treasury for examination. The clause as to the payments to the associations was that the payments should be "on the basis of such statements, in so far as they are approved by the Army Council." If English words had any meaning, that provision meant that the payments made to the associations were to be made if the Army Council considered that such payments were necessary. He had very often listened to the hon. Gentleman opposite when he stood below the gangway on that side of the House, and when his contention always was that Treasury sanction should be obtained, and if Treasury sanction was not obtained, at any rate no sum should be voted without the consent of the House of Commons. He had sat on the Public Accounts Committee with the hon. Gentleman, and he had heard him speak at great length on this subject. Now, as he understood, the hon. Gentleman had thrown over all his principles, and was prepared to approve a plan which would give the Army Council power to vote money to County Associations without the consent of the Treasury, and without the consent of Parliament. He had received so many shocks since he returned to Parliament about a year ago that nothing done by hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House would surprise him. He approved very heartily of the Amendment. He could not conceive that there could be any objection to it. The result of it would be that when the association had submitted to the Army Council their Estimate, the Army Council, when they had approved of it, would have to say to the Treasury that they approved of the Estimate, and that they required their sanction to it. Was not that a practice which had obtained almost from time immemorial? Why should that practice be overthrown? The hon. Gentleman had given no reason that he could understand. The question touched the whole system of control by the Treasury of the expenditure of the nation. Unless some satisfactory explanation was given he should support the Amendment of his hon. friend.

CAPTAIN CRAIG thought that the the Treasury had too much to do with the Territorial Force. But if they were to interfere at all, this was the very place where the sanction of the Treasury should be required. It appeared to him to be very much simpler that the Treasury should sanction the requirements before the Army Council gave the order to have them carried out. He understood that the payments by the Army Council to the associations were to be made on a statement of the requirements of the associations. But if the Army Council made payments to a county association on such a basis, it could be afterwards vetoed by the Treasury under sub-section 3. If that were the case it seemed to him that the Treasury should, in the first instance, be consulted on the basis of the statement of requirements, and, if the Treasury gave their sanction, then the county association and the Army Council would be backed up by the fact that the amount and the details were approved. Supposing that the Army Council desired to introduce some small amendments into the scheme of the county association, and sent it back to be altered in accordance with what their experience of other counties suggested to be necessary, it seemed to him that between the Army Council and the county association there would be no finality whatever. The Amendment would tend to simplify what would prove to be an exceedingly complicated situation in the working of the Bill, and upon those grounds he should support it.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 42; Noes, 219. (Division List No. 190.)

## AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn,SirAlex.F.
Balcarres, Lord
Barrie,H.T.(Londonderry,N.)
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingham
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Forster, Henry William
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,SirHenrySeymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Morpeth, Viscount
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles,SirJohn Scurrah
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool,Walton)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Sir F. Banbury and Captain Craig.

## NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir JH.(Essex,Romford
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Causton,RtmnRichard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies,W.Howell (Bristol,S.)
Dewar,Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles

*Sir F. Banbury.*

Findlay, Alexander
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor(Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil(St. Pancras, E.)
Levy, Maurice
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncaster
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C.E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick, B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Verney, F. W.
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J.D. (Dumbartonshire)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham), Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH moved an Amendment to provide that the power of the Army Council to allow a County Association to apply money paid to it to purposes other than those specified in its statement of requirements should be subject to the sanction of the Treasury. He said that this was a question about which there was a good deal of doubt, but in his opinion it was a power which ought to be held by the Army Council subject to the approval of the Treasury for the good of the public service. It was a power which ought to be exercised with the greatest consideration, and only when full justification was shown. A heavy responsibility rested upon the Treasury in sanctioning the use of that power, and the fullest information upon the point ought to be laid before the House of Commons at the earliest possible moment. The sanction of the Treasury was absolutely necessary if expenditure was to be subject to the constitutional safeguards which had hitherto been enforced. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 4, line 39, at end, to insert the words 'after the sanction of the Treasury has been obtained.'"—(*Mr. Victor Cavendish.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. BUCHANAN said it appeared to him that the hon. Gentleman had misapprehended the power to be conferred on the Army Council. The Army Council could not exercise the right of transfer from one subhead to another. The sixth sub-section of the clause said—

"Regulations made for the purposes of this section shall be subject to the consent of the Treasury."

If the Army Council exercised their powers under Sub-section 3 of the clause they could only do so subject to the regulations made under the Act. The regulations must be made subject to the consent of the Treasury. He did not think, therefore, there was any reason for apprehending that undue powers were being given to the Army Council. Believing that the expenditure of public money for any purpose sanctioned by the Army Council was properly safeguarded, he could not accept the Amendment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he followed the hon. Gentleman's meaning up to the last sentence. He understood the hon. Gentleman to say at the commencement that he did not wish the Army Council to have any power under this section to transfer from one subhead to another. The power of transfer was a valuable one when properly used for securing due economy in administration. If that were all that was in the section, he would not object to it. But at the end of his speech the hon. Gentleman seemed to indicate that it went further. He claimed for the Army Council power to transfer as between any of the purposes stated by an association when it made its claim. He did not think it was the intention of the Government that the Army Council should have power to transfer money voted under one subhead to another.

MR. BUCHANAN was understood to assent.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he understood it was the intention of the Government that the Army Council should in future exercise the same discretion as it did now with the consent of the Treasury.

MR. BUCHANAN: Within the subheads.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that was perfectly satisfactory as a statement of policy. The third sub-section of the clause said—

"All money so paid to an association shall, subject to regulations under this Act, be applicable to any of the purposes specified in the approved statements in accordance with which the money has been granted, but not otherwise except with the written consent of the Army Council."

But the money allotted to an association under this sub-section would be subject to any regulation subsequently passed and of which the House had no knowledge. Under the sub-section as it stood a County Association, without coming to the War Office at all for sanction, might spend money allotted to it for one purpose on any of the other purposes in the approved statement. There was nothing in the sub-section to prevent it. This was really a proposal to grant to the new associations a power which was not now possessed by the Secretary of State for War.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said regulations were contemplated.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the House had no control over the regulations, and if no regulations were issued the section would still work. The regulations had not yet been drafted. They would be laid before the House, but there would be no opportunity for discussing them. He submitted that the sub-section went infinitely beyond what the Government wished to claim. If the Government accepted the Amendment they would get all they wanted. What was the objection to accepting it? He asked the right hon. Gentleman to reconsider the position. This was a matter in which all sections of the House were interested. They were all agreed in the object they wished to secure. If in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman the Amendment was a mere question of surplusage, let him accept the words to which they attached importance.

MR. HALDANE said the section provided for regulations as between the associations and the Army Council. Parliament voted money under general heads, and under the practice that was followed there might be transfers from subhead to subhead, but the clause would bring in more control to the Army Council. The association would submit an annual statement of necessary requirements, and the whole machinery of the clause was subject to the regulations of the Treasury. The association could only apply the money to the specific purpose mentioned in the statement, and the transfer from head to head, or even from subhead to subhead, by the association was not within the intention of the Government or the wording of the clause. The power of transfer from one purpose to another was restricted to purposes within the subhead. If that were so, to add the words of the Amendment would be redundant.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he was not certain that he had made his meaning clear. He quite agreed that there was nothing in the Bill to weaken the control which the Treasury had over the War Office or Army Council. What he was referring to was the County Associations who would not be familiar with Parliamentary Votes, and still less with Parliamentary financial control and checks. The form prepared by the Army Council to be filled up by the County Associations might not be one which the House would adopt; and the County Associations might assume that any money paid to them could be spent in any way they chose, and, owing to the limited form of audit, there would be no way of following up the expenditure of the grants made. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would look very closely into the matter and invite the opinion of the Treasury upon it, with a view to prevent any abuse of the financial procedure he had adopted for the County Associations.

MR. HALDANE said that what the right hon. Gentleman had stated was quite reasonable, although he himself thought that what he feared was covered by the words of the clause. However, he would undertake between now and the Report stage to consult not only his own financial experts, but to bring the matter to the notice of the Treasury.

* MR. McCRAE said that the question at issue was very much larger than that to which it had been whittled down in the discussion between the Secretary of State for War and the right hon. Member for East Worcestershire. What the members of the Public Accounts Committee were most concerned about was not Treasury control but Parliamentary control. They had had instances under the late Government where the Treasury and the Army Council in collusion transferred a sum of no less than £10,000,000, not from one subhead to another, but from one Estimate to another, and they professed to do it under this power of *virement.* He maintained that nothing in the Bill would give the Treasury any other powers than they at present possessed, and that the clause, as drafted, did not safeguard Parliamentary control, or even the power of the Treasury over the exceptions provided for. As he understood the speech of the Secretary of State for War, the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to admit that they ought not to go further with this power of *virement;* and if he was prepared to give an undertaking to provide for that in this clause on Report they might allow the discussion to close. The Amendment moved by the hon. Member for West Derbyshire would not give them any further financial control. He had instances in his mind in which the Treasury and the Army Council avoided Parliamentary control. Subsection of Clause 3 stated that—

> "All money so paid to an association shall, subject to regulations under this Act, be applicable to any of the purposes specified in the approved statements in accordance with which the money has been granted, but not otherwise except with the written consent of the Army Council."

Surely that provided that all that the Treasury could do was to make regulations under the Act to regulate the exceptions granted under the Act. He was sure that the Secretary of State for War did not wish to give the military men a free hand in regard to expenditure; but, unless some undertaking was given, a very wide field would be left for the evasion of the financial control which at present obtained with regard to Army expenditure.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what this strange word *virement* is? Is it Gaelic or Welsh?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the word was old French, but it had become official here, and if the hon. Gentleman referred to the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee he would find that it had been adopted and indexed for official use. It meant turning one thing into another. There was a notorious case where, for nine years in succession, the War Office had taken money for nine batteries of artillery which they had not the least idea of spending on these batteries, but of spending for other purposes. He thought the practice was most detrimental to sound finance.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH said that after the undertaking given by the Secretary of State for War he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone) said he wished to move the omission of Sub-section 4 of Clause 3 in order to elicit from the right hon. Gentleman an explanation of its meaning. The subsection began "all other money received by an association." It was obvious from that that other moneys would be received, but where were they to come from? The words of the Bill suggested that money would come otherwise than from an official quarter, which the right hon. Gentleman had led them to believe was the only quarter from which money would come. If they looked at another portion of the clause they found that the money was to be paid in such sums as "in the opinion of the Army Council" were required to meet the necessary expenditure. According to those words it would depend upon whether the expenditure was necessary, and consequently it meant that if the associations incurred expenditure which in the opinion of the Army Council was unnecessary, the money must be found from some other quarter in order that the expenditure might be defrayed. What he wanted to ask was where the money was to come from. Was it expected that the Lord-Lieutenant of the county, who, he was quite sure, was rejoicing that he had been elevated to such an important position as President of this Association, the provisions in regard to which he hoped would never come into force—was it expected that the Lord-Lieutenant should go round, to use a common expression, "with the hat" and solicit money from the various members of the community over which he presided? He knew that the right hon. Gentleman based his schemes of committees and associations on the experience gained in the South African War, but the organisation of these associations would have to take place in peace time, and the South African committees were dependent upon voluntary subscriptions. That made a great difference, and he would like to know whether when the right hon. Gentleman proposed the scheme he had at the back of his mind the idea that the county was coming forward at the bidding of the Lord-Lieutenant to find the money which perhaps a parsimonious War Office would not give. This provision, in his opinion, was of an entirely redundant character, and he sincerely hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would put down his foot once and for all and say that the service of the State should be maintained by the State.

Amendment proposed—

"In page 5, line 1, to leave out Subsection (4)."—(*Viscount Castlereagh.*)

Question proposed, "That Subsection (4) stand part of the Clause."

MR. HALDANE said the associations, which would, he trusted, form a real element in the social life of the county, might, for example, desire to offer prizes to be competed for among the battalions, and there might be people who would wish to give subscriptions for such a purpose. The subsection was intended to meet cases of that kind, to describe the ambit of the powers of the associations.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE ERESBY (Lincolnshire, Horncastle) said that many Yeomanry as well as Militia and Volunteer regiments possessed certain funds and also plate. Was it intended that such property would pass to the associations for the benefit of the Territorial Army?

MR. HALDANE said that that matter was dealt with in Section 28, subsection (3), which provided for the transfer to the association of any property belonging to a unit, but subject to the trusts upon which it was previously held, or, where there was no trust, only with the consent of the unit ascertained and certified in the prescribed manner.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said that he felt rather alarmed at the statement which had been made. If the county associations were to be entrusted with these powers and were to be in receipt of income from other than national sources they ought not to receive any bequests or legacies to be applied for purposes apart from those of national concern. So surely as the Government allowed them to receive money in the way of gifts they would be opening the door to all sorts of collusion and jobbery. He did not believe that it was proper that these associations should be the recipients of legacies and gifts for one part of the Army rather than another. One county association might be very successful in regard to the receipt of gifts or legacies while another county association was not, and there would be set up a condition of inequality which was not desirable. He hoped that the Amendment would be accepted and carried on the ground that they would not get fair treatment all round unless they prohibited the county associations from augmenting their incomes in the way suggested.

SIR F. BANBURY said that he did not agree with his right hon. friend in thinking that this section opened the door to jobbery. In his opinion the section was a good one, provided that the Secretary of State was desirous of receiving voluntary contributions for the purpose of maintaining the Territorial Army. If that was the object of the right hon. Gentleman, then the clause could not be better drawn. At the same time, he thought that it was an extraordinary thing to introduce in a national Army Bill a clause whereby permission was given to send round the hat asking for subscriptions to the Army as if it were a hospital or a voluntary school. Did the right hon. Gentlemen propose to give a grant-in-aid to the Territorial Army and allow the county associations to go round for subscriptions?

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH said he did not think the answer of the hon. Gentleman in any sense disposed of the question. It was obvious that the expenses of the "powers and duties" under this section should be defrayed at the cost of the nation.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) asked whether, if he left money to an association to encourage cadet battalions and corps and rifle clubs, the association would be able to spend it for that purpose.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the right hon. Gentleman had expressed his determination to maintain equality among the various units which were to be established in the Territorial Army, and he asked what was to prevent people subscribing to put a particular unit in a more favourable position than its neighbour. Another point on which emphasis had been laid was that there should be nothing in the nature of handing the hat round in regard to the Territorial Force. Would not the sub-section, however, authorise an association to solicit assistance?

MR. HALDANE said the Government had never said they wanted to put the associations in a worse position than the Regular Army by depriving them of the chance of receiving a legacy—for prizes for shooting, for instance. Many of the most distinguished regiments had attached to them societies which depended upon the exercise of voluntary co-operation and assistance, and which did most useful work. He contemplated that there would be a great deal of interest in these associations in the counties, and very likely people would give cups and the like, and he hoped they would sometimes leave legacies. He was not prepared to put the associations in the position in which a felon used to be under the old law, or in which a married woman was in the old benighted times, so that they could not take and hold any property. The money was to be applied to whatever purposes were within the scope of the associations, and not otherwise.

**VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH** pointed out that there were certain duties paid for by the State, and asked if voluntary contributions would lighten the burdens of the State in respect of those duties.

**CAPTAIN CRAIG** asked whether, if a county association had been liberally dealt with during the year by private gentlemen, the amount which had been so received would be knocked off the estimate when it came before the Army Council? If that were not so, would the money be for the use of the county association in future years for its own benefit? If a few hundreds a year were left to a county association, would that money go towards the reduction of the estimates prepared to meet the expenses of that association, or would it go to supplement the money coming from the War Office, and therefore make that particular county more efficient than neighbouring counties? That was the real gravamen of the matter. He could imagine a sort of rivalry between counties each to maintain its own force in a state of efficiency; so that this point about voluntary subscriptions undoubtedly raised a very wide issue. The right hon. Gentleman had not thrown very much light on the exact definition of the words "powers and duties." If the powers and duties were not to be met entirely out of the funds of the Army Council, it seemed to him that the right hon. Gentleman's desire to have all the forces on one level would be difficult of accomplishment. That desire would be defeated by this clause, which was obviously intended to apply to a little more than a few cups to be shot for. If the War Office was not prepared to pay all the expenses necessary to make a county association capable of maintaining the efficiency of its force, then they must have subscriptions from those who were desirous of maintaining the regiment in efficiency. If that was the intention of this Radical Government, it was time the country understood where they were in regard to the matter. He thought the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman contrasted very unfavourably with the hopes which he had held out to them, and that even the very short time which had been allowed to them to discuss this very wide issue had more than shown the need of the Amendment, the rejection of which would cause very considerable dissatisfaction in the country.

And, it being half-past Ten of the clock, the Chairman proceeded, pursuant to the Order of the House of 6th May, to put forthwith the Question on the Amendment already proposed from the Chair.

Question put, "That Sub-section (4) stand part of the clause."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 307; Noes, 94. (Division List No. 191.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (S'mers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, R'mford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.

Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunne,Major E.Martin (Wals'll
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Right Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,Hugh Cecil (St.Pancras,E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B.(Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick,B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, H. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.

Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W. (Hull,W.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,Rt. Hn.A.J.(CityLond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt.H. G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Coates, E.Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings,Rt.Hn.J. (Birm'gham)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence (Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt. Hn. Col.W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King,Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants.,Fareh'm
Lockwood, Rt. Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R
Long, Col. CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Parkes, Ebenezer
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,JohnFrederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool,Walton
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt.Hn. J.G. (Oxf'dUniv
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col.W.H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A.Stanley (York,E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Viscount Castlereagh and Captain Craig.

The Chairman then proceeded to put successively the Questions necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded.

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 298; Noes, 102. (Division List No. 192.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allan, A.Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt.Hn.Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott (Somers't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William

Clynes, J. R.
Coats,Sir T.Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H. (Sussex,E.Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies,David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithness-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey,W.E.(Derbyshire, N.E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,Colonel Ivor (Mon.,S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,Sir D.Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H.Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N. (Donc'r)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,Sir W.D. (Colchester)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John(Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E. (Dundee)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton,Sir John L.(Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitely, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hon. C.H.W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Barrie, H.T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A. (Worc.
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingham
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibbs, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hodge, John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull)
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt-. Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Grady, J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seddon, J.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Clause 4 :

Question put, "That the clause stand part of the Bill."

The Committee divided :—Ayes, 298 ; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 193.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (S'merset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs, Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buchanan, Thomas Ryburn
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas

Buxton, Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt.Hn.Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston S.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coates, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, Ellis William (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Wals'll
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh.
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paul, Herbert
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs., Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Radford, G. H.
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'h
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick. B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)

Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Willams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Hn. C. H. W. (Hull, W.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

## NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Byles, William Pollard
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'gham)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fetherstonhaugh, Godfrey
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gibb, G. A. (Bristol, West)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hodge, John
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Jowett, F. W.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
King, Sir Henry Seymour (Hull
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
O'Grady, J.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Percy, Earl
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Seddon, J.
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Walsh, Stephen
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Whereupon the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House. Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at fourteen minutes after Eleven o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

# PUBLIC BILLS

## DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CLXXIV.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

### (A.) House of Lords.

| Title of Bill. | Brought in by | Progress. |
|---|---|---|
| *Companies [H.L.] | *Earl of Granard* | Report 11th May (749)<br>Read 3ª and passed 16th May (1071) |
| *Destructive Insects and Pests [H.L.] | *Earl Carrington* | Read 3ª and passed 13th May (561) |
| *Employment of Women | *Earl Beauchamp* | Read 2ª 13th May (565)<br>Committee Report } 14th May (763)<br>Read 3ª and passed 15th May (922) |
| *Factory and Workshop [H.L.] | *Earl Beauchamp* | Read 2ª 14th May (735) |
| House of Lords Reform [H.L.] | *Lord Newton* | Second Reading 7th May (3) |
| Irish Tobacco | *Lord Oranmore and Browne* | Read 2ª 7th May (45) |
| *Matrimonial Clauses Act Amendment [H.L.] | *Lord Chancellor* | Read 2ª 8th May (199)<br>Committee Report } 14th May (763) |
| Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment [H.L.] | *Lord Ampthill* | Read 2ª 28th May (1456) |
| *Prize Courts [H.L.] | *Lord Chancellor* | Read 2ª 8th May (200)<br>Committee Report } 14th May (763)<br>Read 3ª and passed 15th May (922) |
| *Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) | *Earl of Crewe* | Read 1ª 14th May (764) |

## (B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

| Title of Bill. | Brought in by | Progress. |
|---|---|---|
| Advertisement Regulations | *Mr. Hart Davies* | Report 10th May (531) |
| *Australian States Constitution [H.L.] | *Mr. Churchill* | Read 1° 13th May (646) |
| *Butter and Margarine | *Sir E. Strachey* | Read 2° 8th May (280) |
| *Companies [H.L.] | *Mr. Lloyd George* | Read 1° 16th May (1112) |
| Conveyancing | *Mr. Micklem* | Read 1° 14th May (804) |
| *Criminal Appeal | *Sir J. Walton* | Second Reading 8th May (282) |
| Diseases of Animals Act (1896) Amendment | *Mr. Cairns* | Read 1° 14th May (804) |
| Education (Popular Control) | *Mr. D. A. Thomas* | Read 1° 15th May (983) |
| *Evidence (Colonial Statutes) | *Mr. Churchill* | Read 1° 14th May (805) |
| *Finance | *Mr. Asquith* | Second Reading 13th May (651) (717)<br>Second Reading 14th May (805) |
| *Imported Watch Cases | *Mr. Kearley* | Read 1° 14th May (804) |
| Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment | *Sir H. Vincent* | Read 1° 29th May (1707) |
| *Irish Council | *Mr. Birrell* | Read 1° 9th May (78) |
| *Land Values (Scotland) | *Mr. T. Shaw* | Read 1° 13th May (646) |
| Married Women's Property | *Mr. Micklem* | Read 1° 14th May (804) |
| *Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) Deductions for Propelling Power | *Mr. Lloyd George* | Read 2° 24th May (1267) |
| Municipal Elections | *Mr. Cleland* | Read 2° 27th May (1448) |
| Notification of Births | *Lord R. Cecil* | Read 2° 8th May (332) |
| Old Age Pensions | *Mr. W. H. Lever* | Read 2° 10th May (470) |
| Petty Sessions Clerks (Ireland) | *Mr. Sloan* | Read 1° 8th May (245) |
| *Post Office Sites | *Mr. Buxton* | Read 2° 8th May (278) |
| Primogeniture | *Mr. A. Herbert* | Read 1° 8th May (244) |

## (B) House of Commons.—*continued.*

| Title of Bill. | Brought in by | Progress. |
|---|---|---|
| *Probation of Offenders | *Mr. H. Samuel* | Read 2° 8th May (294) |
| Public Health | *Mr. J. W. Wilson* | Read 2° 14th May (919) |
| Public Rights of Way (No. 2) | *Mr. J. R. Macdonald* | Read 2° 27th May (1448) |
| Purity of Milk Supplies (Scotland) | *Mr. Watt* | Read 1° 28th May (1480) |
| Reformatory and Industrial Schools (No. 2) | *Mr. G. Greenwood* | Read 1° 7th May (77) |
| *Released Persons (Poor Law) Relief | *Mr. H. Samuel* | Read 2° 24th May (1291) |
| Restraint of Trade (Shops) | *Mr. Seddon* | Read 1° 8th May (244) |
| Settled Land | *Mr. Micklem* | Read 1° 14th May (804) |
| Shops (No. 3) | *Sir C. Dilke* | Read 1° 7th May (78) |
| *Small Holdings and Allotments | *Mr. Harcourt* | Read 1° 27th May (1377) (1414) |
| Sunday Trading (Scotland) | *Mr. A. C. Corbett* | Read 1° 8th May (245) |
| Teachers of Music (Registration) | *Mr. O'Neill* | Read 1° 9th May (375) |
| *Territorial and Reserve Forces | *Mr. Haldane* | Committee 28th May (1481) |
|  |  | Committee 29th May (1657) |
| *Vaccination | *Mr. Burns* | Read 2° 24th May (1271) |

# APPENDIX II.

## HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1907.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

*In Continuation of List given in previous Volume.*

| Title of Paper. | Date from which the Period runs. | Period to lie upon the Table. |
|---|---|---|
| College Charter Act, 1871 (College of Science at South Kensington),—Copy of Application received from the Board of Education for the establishment of a College of Science and Technology at South Kensington, referred by His Majesty in Council for the consideration and Report of a Committee of His Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council; together with a Copy of the Draft of the Charter applied for [34 and 35 Vic., c. 73, s. 2] | 7 May | 30 days |
| Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Council of the County of Lancaster, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Clayton-le-Moors, Oswaldtwistle, and Church Urban Districts [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)] | 9 May | 40 days |
| Education (Scotland) (Continuation Classes),—Copy of Code of Regulations for Continuation Classes providing further Instruction for those who have left School, 1906 [35 and 36 Vic., c. 62, s. 67] | 13 May | One month |
| Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copies of Orders made by the Council of the Borough of Accrington, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Borough [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)] | 16 May | 40 days |
| Factory and Workshop Acts (Homework),—Copy of Order made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying to certain classes of work the provisions of Sections 107, 108 and 110 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and revoking the Order of the 15th August 1905 [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 126 (3)] | 28 May | 40 days |
| Factory and Workshop Acts (Particulars of Piece Work Wages),—Copies of Two Orders made by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, dated 23rd May, 1907, applying with modifications the provisions of Section 116 of The Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, to Non-Textile Factories and Workshops in which certain classes of industries are carried on, and to Outworkers employed in those industries [1 Edw. VII., c. 22, s. 126 (3)] | 28 May | 40 days |

# INDEX

TO THE

# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

## SIXTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

*MAY* 7—*MAY* 29.

---

### EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

---

**Abbeylara**

Reinstatement Claims of T. Reilly, P. Brady and Alice Connor.
*Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13,* 572.

**Abbeyleix**

Boycotting of Jackson, Dunne and Draper—Protection afforded by Police, etc.
*Qs.* Col. McCalmont, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *May 7,* 72, 73,

**Aberdeen Corporation Bill**

*l.* Report from Select Committee, *May 29,* 1585.

**Abraham, Mr. W.** [Cork Co., N.E.]

Carrignavar—Reinstatement Claim of J. O'Regan, *May 29,* 1615.

**Achill and Mulrany**

Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 13,* 587.

**Ackworth and Kirk Smeaton Light Railway**

Order Presented, *May 14,* 734, 768.

**Adkins, Mr. W. R.** [Lancashire, Middleton]

- Education
  - Secondary
    - Condition of, lack of Facilities, etc., Necessity for dealing with the Matter, *May 15* 1039–1046.
    - Local Control, Extension of Principle of to all Secondary Schools, and Training Colleges, proposed, *May 15,* 1042, 1044.
  - Training Colleges, Abolition of Sectarian Tests, proposed, *May 15,* 1040.

**Administrative County of London and District Electric Power Bill**

*c.* Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *May 9,* 460.

**Admiralty**

*First Lord.*—Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.

*Financial Secretary.*—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.

- Contracts
  - Articles for which Contractors are not bound to use British Materials.
    *Q.* Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 13,* 604.

[*cont.*

**Admiralty**—*cont.*

Contracts—*cont.*

Beer Contracts, Allocation of.
*Qs.* Sir F. Banbury; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 9*, 351, 352.

**Advertisements Regulation Bill**
*c. Con.* May 10*, 531.

**Africa, Central**
Education, Grant-in-Aid for.
*Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1313.

**Africa, East**
[*See also Names of Places*].

Cotton-growing, Conditions of Government Assistance to.
*Qs.* Mr. Courthope, Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8*, 215, 216.
*Qs.* Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 15*, 950, 951.

Grogan Case—Telegram sent by Colonial Secretary to Commissioner, Date of.
*Q.* Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 619.

Nairobi Prison

Cost of, and Date of Completion.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 7*, 61.

Using for all European Prisoners instead of Mombasa, proposed.
*Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 28*, 1469.

Senoussi Movement, Allegations as to Spread of.
*Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 623.

Steamship Communication with—Proposals for Encouragement of British Lines.
*Qs.* Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1634, 1635.

**Africa, South**
[*See also Names of Colonies, etc.*]

Garrison, Stores and Supplies sent in 1906, Value and Description of.
*Qs.* Mr. Remnant; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 8*, 207, 208.
*Q.* Mr. Higham; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 13*, 636.

Trade—Reason for Decline in British Exports and Proposals for Improving Trade Relations.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 9*, 359.

**Africa, West**
[*See also Names of Places*].

Deep-water Landing Places, Ownership of.
*Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 9*, 354, 355.

**Africa West**—*cont.*

Shipping Arrangements for Government Railway Materials—Conditions of Rebate given on Elder Dempster Line, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 9*, 353, 354; *May 23*, 1161.

Volta District, Trade with—Effect and Incidence of Canoe Tax and Salt Tax.
*Q.* Mr. Higham; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8*, 216.

**Agriculture**
Grants to, in England—Comparison with Scotland and Ireland.
*Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 7*, 64.

Ireland—Reports as to Migratory Labourers (1906), Presented, *May 13*, 535, 569.

**Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of**
*President.*—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

Appropriations-in-Aid, Reasons for Reduction of.
*Os.* Mr. Carlile, *May 23*, 1210.
Experimental Research, Increased Expenditure on and Advantages of.
*Os.* Mr. Carlile, *May 23*, 1210.

Map-mounters, Reason for Appointment of.
*Os.* Mr. Carlile, *May 23*, 1203.

Report (1906) Presented, *May 16*, 1078; *May 23*, 1152; *May 28*, 1451.

Vote for, *May 23*, 1167.

**Agricultural and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland**
*Vice-President*—Rt. Hon. T. W. Russell.

Constitution of Agriculture Board, Council of Agriculture and Technical Instruction Board.
*Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 977.

Funds at Disposal of and Proposals for Allocating.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 974.

Meeting, Date of Holding.
*Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 235, 236.

Travelling Veterinary Inspector, Proposals for Appointing.
*Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 238.

Vice-President, Appointment of.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *May 8*, 236.

**Alden, Mr. P.** [Middlesex, Tottenham]
Court of Criminal Appeal, Cases likely to be Submitted to, and Probable Cost of, *May 13*, 590.

Swaziland, Cession of Portion to Transvaal, Negotiations for, *May 15*, 939.

*May* 7—*May* 29.

**Aliens**

Arrivals and Expulsion Orders (January March)—Return Presented, *May 23*, 1151; *May 28*, 1452.

Crimes Committed by, in London, during 1906.
  *Q.* Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 8*, 219.

Criminals Convicted during 1906.
  *Q.* Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 14*, 790.

Expelled Aliens, Provision for Dealing with, in Case of Return.
  *Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 13*, 634.

Immigration Officers, Information as to Work done by.
  *Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *May 16*, 1134; Viscount Turnour, 1136; Mr. Runciman, 1139.

Naturalisation—Anomalies in *status* of Naturalised British Subjects, Removal of, proposed.
  *Os.* Earl Russell, *May 15*, 922–924; Lord Loreburn, 924.
  *Q.* Mr. S. Samuel; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 8*, 219.

**Alkali, &c. Works**

Report Presented, *May 23*, 1153; *May 28*, 1455.

**Allen,, Mr. C. P.** [Gloucester, Stroud]

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1486.

**Alton**

Military Hospital, Use of.
  *Q.* Mr. W. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 15*, 948.

**Alverstone, Lord.**—*Lord Chief Justice.*

Companies Bill, *Rep.*, *May 14*, 753, 754, 756.

**Ambrose, Dr. R.** [Mayo, W.]

Mayo, County Council Grant, Deduction from in Respect of Land Purchase, *May 10*, 464.

**Ampthill, Lord**

German Colonial Legislative proposals as to British Indians, *May 29*, 1589, 1590.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *May 28*, 1456, 1459.

Transvaal
  British Indians in.
    Correspondence Relating to Legislation Affecting, Expediting Tabling of, *May 29*, 1586.
    Transvaal Registration Bill, Restrictions Imposed by, Attitude of His Majesty's Government towards, etc., *May 29*, 1586–1591.
  Loan of £5,000,000 Guaranteed by His Majesty's Government, Conditions of Granting, *May 29*, 1591.

**Annagh Bogs.**

Ownership of
  *Qs.* Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 229.

**Ancient Monuments, Ireland**

*See under* Ireland.

**Anson, Sir W. R.** [Oxford University]

Education
  Secondary
    Condition of, Lack of Facilities, etc., Necessity for Dealing with the Matter, *May 15*, 1056–1061.
    Local Control, Extension of Principle of to all Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, proposed, *May 15*, 1056–1059.
  Training Colleges, Abolition of Sectarian Tests, proposed, *May 15*, 10 1060.

Victoria and Albert Museum, Arrangement and Organisation—Appointment of Advisory Committee, *May 7*, 69.

**Anstruther-Gray, Major** [St. Andrews Burghs]

Army
  Cavalry Barracks in Scotland, Decision as to, *May 16*, 1091.
  Horses, Provision of, in Time of War, *May 7*, 57.
  Territorial Force, Conditions of Service for, *May 13*, 609.

Irish Council Bill Grant, Scottish Contribution towards, *May 14*, 800.

Militia
  Artillery, Mounted Training for Officers, and Rank and File, Facilities for, *May 13*, 609, 610, 611.
  Reorganisation Proposals, Postponement of, proposed, *May 13*, 610.

New Hebrides—Female and Child Labour, Restrictions on Recruitment of, *May 14*, 785.

Rifle Clubs, Issue of Army Rifles unsuitable for Conversion, proposed, *May 13*, 606.

St. Helena, Condition of, and Government Proposals for assisting Emigration, *May 14*, 786.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Proposals for Extension of certain Provisions to England, *May 16*, 1091.

Volunteers—Decision in Case of Gunner Crossan, *May 13*, 610.

Woolwich Arsenal Discharges, Reconsideration of Decision proposed, *May 7*, 57.

**Anthrax**

Scientific Experiments and Inquiries, Result of.

*Os.* Sir F. Channing, *May 23*, 1186; Sir E. Strachey, 1201.

**Antrim**

Post Office—Application of T. Connolly for Transfer.

*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 7*, 50.

**Argentina**

Trade Report Presented, *May 16*, 1070.

**Arkwright, Mr. J. S.** [Hereford]

Imperial Conference, 1907—Address by Chancellor of the Exchequer, Australian Imports of British Goods in 1906 and Value affected by proposed Scheme, *May 8*, 213.

Imports from Colonies and British Possessions in 1905, *May 13*, 628.

Irish Grazing Farms under Police Protection, *May 8*, 238; *May 15*, 977.

**Armagh**

Labourer's Cottage Loan, Reason for Delay in sanctioning.

*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 936, 937.

**Armagh Urban District Council Bill**

*c.* Reported from Police and Sanitary Committee, *May 16*, 1076.

*Con.** *May 29*, 1609.

**Armaments**

Expenditure on, Possibility of reducing.

*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 655.

**Armitage, Mr. R.** [Leeds, Central]

Schools, Expenditure by Local Authorities on Provision of since 1870, *May 8*, 202.

**Army**

*Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

*Parliamentary Secretary*—Earl of Portsmouth.

*Financial Secretary*—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.

Artillery, Fortieth Brigade Royal Field—Compensation for Expenditure incurred through cancelled Orders.

*Q.* Mr. Harris; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 16*, 1090, 1091.

Auxiliary Forces *see* titles Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry.

Barracks with no Accommodation for Royal Army Temperance Association.

*Q.* Mr. C. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 16*, 1090.

Billeting of Soldiers, Authority responsible for Arrangements as to.

*Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 8*, 208.

**Army**—*cont.*

Bulford Camp—Communication with Tidworth.

*Q.* Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 573.

Cavalry Barracks in Scotland, Decision as to.

*Q.* Maj. Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 16*, 1091.

*Q.* Col. Harrison-Broadley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 23*, 1159, 1160.

Engineer Civil Staff, Position of—Proposals for Improvement, etc.

*Qs.* Mr. G. Baring; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 15*, 947, 948.

Horses, Provision of, in Time of War.

*Q.* Maj. Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 7*, 57.

Lyddite Shell manufactured at Ordnance Factories, Cause for and Percentage of Rejections.

*Qs.* Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 608, 609.

Marines, Royal, *see that title.*

Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those titles.*

Nealon, Michael, Inquiry into Case of, proposed.

*Q.* Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 15*, 947.

Officers

Brigadiers-General—Decision as to Honorary Rank on Retirement.

*Q.* Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 572.

Majors, Supernumerary, of Disbanded Infantry Battalions, Appointments offered to.

*Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 23*, 1159.

Pensions

Craig, Hugh, and S. Lisle, Cases of.

*Qs.* Mr. W. Benn; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 9*, 348, 349; *May 24*, 1235.

Extension of System to Aged Poor Soldiers over sixty-five even if not in possession of Medal, proposed.

*Qs.* Sir G. S. Robertson, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 29*, 1628.

Murphy, T., and J. Tracy, Cases of.

*Qs.* Mr. Farrell; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 10*, 469, 470.

Piershill Barracks—Date of Occupation by Artillery.

*Q.* Col. Harrison-Broadley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 23*, 1160.

Recruiting and Enlistment—Minimum Age for Enlistment.

*Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 27*, 1380.

Rifles—Date of Completion of Conversion of Number mentioned in Estimates.

*Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 8*, 208, 209.

[*cont.*

**Army**—*cont.*

Reservists, Special, Pay, etc., of.
*Q.* Viscount Morpeth; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 15*, 948.

Sandhurst Cadets, Cause for Delay in Gazetting.
*Q.* Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 16*, 1094.

Scots Greys

Decision as to quartering at Tidworth instead of Bulford.
*Q.* Mr. W. Long; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 14*, 783.
*Q.* Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 23*, 1154.

Horses, Number of and Accommodation for.
*Q.* Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 23*, 1153.

Second Line, *see subheading* Territorial Forces.

Soldiers, Civil Employment for on Discharge

Circular issued by War Office, Result of—Issuing Papers relating to, proposed.
*Os.* Lord Monkswell, *May 29*, 1599, 1602, 1603; Earl of Portsmouth, 1603, 1604.

Papers relating to, Ordered, *May 29*, 1607.

Recommendations of Ward Committee, Reason for not giving effect to.
*Os.* Lord Monkswell, *May 29*, 1600, 1607.

Trades, teaching of, while in the Army, Proposals as to.
*Os.* Lord Monkswell, *May 29*, 1599–1603, 1607; Lord Portsmouth, 1604–1606; Earl of Donoughmore, 1606.

Special Contingent, Pay of.
*Q.* Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 16*, 1094.

Territorial Force

Accounts of County Associations, Audit of.
*Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 9*, 352.

Additional Estimate of Cost—Copy presented, *May 27*, 1294; *May 28*, 1453.

Armament of Artillery.
*Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 27*, 1307.

Conditions of Service—Proposals for securing Uniformity.
*Q.* Maj. Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 609.

Cost of
*Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 28*, 1468.

**Army**—*cont.*

Territorial Force—*cont.*

Deputy-Lieutenants — Measures for securing Competency to organise, etc.
*Q.* Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 23*, 1159.

Enlistment, Regulations governing—Choice of Unit by Recruit, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 607.

Financial Control over Expenditure —Statement Presented, *May 23*, 1153.

Lance-Corporals, Decision as to appointing.
*Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 604, 605: *May 27*, 1306.

Notice of Motion, Postponement of.
*Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *May 14*, 762.

Officers' Privileges as to competing for Commissions in the Regular Army.
*Qs.* Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 29*, 1628, 1629.

Soldiers' Kits, Issue and Maintenance of.
*Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 605; *May 27*, 1307.

Walking-out Uniform, Provision of.
*Qs.* Mr. Ashley, Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 605.
*Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 27*, 1307.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *see that title.*

Woolwich Arsenal, *see that title.*

**Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O.** [Croydon]
Income-Tax — Definition of Authors' Royalties, *May 16*, 1086.

**Ashley, Mr. W. W.** [Lancashire, N., Blackpool]
Agriculture, Grants to, in England—Comparison with Scotland and Ireland, *May 7*, 64.

Army

Recruiting and Enlistment, Minimum Age for Enlistment, *May 27*, 1308.

Territorial Force

Armament of Artillery, *May 27*, 1307.

Enlistment, Regulations governing, *May 13*, 607.

Lance-Corporals, Decision as to, *May 13*, 604; *May 27*, 1306.

Soldiers' Kits, Issue and Maintenance of, *May 13*, 605; *May 27*, 1307.

Walking-out Uniform, Provision of, *May 13*, 605 *May 27*, 1307.

[*cont.*

**Ashley, Mr. W. W.**—*cont.*
  Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 280.
  Egypt—Assouan Dam, Raising of, Source of Payment of Cost and Firm entrusted with Work, *May 7*, 61.
  Greenwich Observatory—Progress of Negotiations as to London County Council Electric Station, *May 14*, 781.
  Imports from Colonies and British Possessions in 1905, *May 13*, 570.
  Morocco Disturbances, Information as to, *May 9*, 356.
  Nairobi Prison—Using for all European Prisoners instead of Mombasa, proposed, *May 28*, 1469.
  South Kensington Technological College—Incorporation Charter, Proposals for Tabling, *May 7*, 69.
  Sweden and Norway—Treaty in Substitution for that of 1885, Progress of Negotiations for, *May 14*, 788.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com*, *May 28*, 1532–1534.
    Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1659, 1665.
  Transvaal Mines—Strike of White Miners, Use of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 27*, 1311.
  University Colleges
    Grant, Allocation of, *May 9*, 366.
    Report of Inspectors, Date of Tabling, *May 9*, 366.
  Volunteer Equipment, Cause for Delay in considering, *May 27*, 1308.

**Ashton, Mr. T. G.** [Beds., Luton]
  Exchequer Bonds, Information as to Number current, etc., *May 9*, 344.

**Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill**
  *l.* Report from Select Committee, *May 16*, 1069.
  3R.* *May 29*, 1585.

**Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.**—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Fife, E.]
  Agriculture, Grants to, in England—Comparison with Scotland and Ireland, *May 7*, 64.
  Business of the House, Course of, *May 13*, 643.
  Canada—Customs Duty on Produce of United Kingdom, Alterations in since 1897, *May 13*, 576, 630.
  Cocoa Duties, Anomalies in, and Proposals for Revision, *May 24*, 1232.
  Companies—Unclaimed Dividends notified in Balance Sheets, Measures for Payment of, proposed, *May 28*, 1472.
  Consols, Government Purchases for Redemption Purposes, *May 27*, 1318.

**Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.**—*cont.*
  Customs and Excise
    Bonded Premises, Sureties for—Penalties inflicted for Irregularities, *May 24*, 1235; *May 27*, 1300.
    Cost of Customs Collection on Preferential Basis for certain Goods, *May 28*, 1472.
    Subscriptions collected or promoted by superior Officers of Customs among Subordinates, Rule as to, *May 15*, 946.
  Education, Primary, Application of Portion of Budget Surplus to, proposed, *May 8*, 76.
  Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills—Amount outstanding on 10th inst., *May 9*, 344; *May 13*, 632.
  Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 847–856, 903.
  Fiscal Policy
    Colonial Preference, Question of—Advantages offered by the Colonies, *May 14*, 850, 853–856.
    Protection, Advantages of System, *May 14*, 847.
  Food and Drink, Taxes on, during 1906–7, *May 28*, 1472.
  Imperial Conference, 1907—Address by Chancellor of the Exchequer.
    Australian Imports of British Goods in 1906 and Value affected by Proposed Scheme, *May 8*, 214.
    Figures given, Method of obtaining, *May 8*, 213.
  Imports from Colonies and British Possessions in 1905, *May 13*, 628, 629.
  Income Tax
    Act of 1842—Effect of Clause 28 and Third Schedule of Finance Bill upon Section 133, *May 13*, 630.
    Author's Royalties, Definition of, *May 16*, 1086.
    Average Yield of, *May 14*, 852.
    Collection, Assimilating English and Scotch Systems, Proposals as to, *May 8*, 253.
    Co-operative Trading Societies, Assessment of, proposed, *May 8*, 206.
    Earned Income of over £2,000, divided into Small Incomes, Assessment of, *May 13*, 631.
    New Proposals—Decision as to Rearrangement of Staff, *May 13*, 593.
    Permanency of, at 1s. in the £, *May 8*, 248.
    Reduction of to 11d. in the £, proposed, *May 8*, 247–249.

[*cont.*

**Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.**—*cont.*
- Income Tax—*cont.*
  - Repayments
    - Increase (1904–1906), Cause of, *May 13*, 631.
    - Section 133, Repayment under during 1904, 1905, and 1906, *May 8*, 218.
  - Three Years Average System, Working of, etc., *May 7*, 65, 66.
  - Unearned Incomes, Rate to be levied on, *May 7*, 65.
- Inter-imperial Trade, Proposals for promoting, *May 13*, 627.
- Irish Council Bill
  - Discussion, Facilities for, *May 13*, 643.
  - Grant, Source of providing, *May 9*, 373.
- Land Purchase Stock, Correct Designation of, *May 15*, 946.
- Land Tax, Friendly Societies, Regulations as to Exemption of, *May 9*, 356.
- Post Office Savings Bank, Limit of £200.
  - Accounts exceeding through Accumulation of Interest—Return proposed, *May 13*, 592.
  - Extension of, proposed, *May 13*, 593.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Land Court, Limiting Expenses in respect of to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1358.
- Solicitors License Duty in Ireland, Abolition of, proposed, *May 15*, 933.
- Taxation
  - Basis of, Necessity for broadening, *May 14*, 852, 853.
  - Local
    - Account, Proposals as to Alteration in, *May 7*, 66.
    - Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System, *May 8*, 277.
- Trawlers Regulation Bill, Facilities for Passage of, *May 13*, 633.
- Tullamore Whisky Frauds—Decision as to Prosecution, etc., *May 13*, 643; *May 15*, 935; *May 27*, 1300.
- Vaccination, Conscientious Objection to—Legislation to assimilate Practice with that existing under Education Laws, proposed, *May 13*, 632.
- Valuation, Quinquennial, Postponement of, proposed, *May 13*, 591.

**Athenry**
- Caheroyan Grazing Tenants, Intimidation of—Measures for Police Protection, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 971.

**Athenry**——*cont.*
- O'Halloran, Constable, Outrage on—Arrests made, etc.
  - *Q.* Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 970.
- Outrage at house of T. Duddy—Police Measures for Protection of District, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1654.

**Attorney-General**
- *Sir J. Walton.*

**Attorney-General for Ireland**
- *Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.*

**Australia**
- (*See also names of States.*)

**Australasia**
- Naval Squadron, *see under* Navy.
- New Hebrides Convention *see under* New Hebrides.

**Australian States Constitution Bill**
- *c.* 1R.* *May 13*, 646.

**Avebury, Lord**
- Companies Bill, *Rep.*, *May 14*, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 762.
- Municipal Representation Bill—Select Committee, Appointment of certain Lords, *May 14*, 763, 764.

**Baghdad Railway**
- Position of Great Britain with regard to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Rees, *May 15*, 1009, 1010; Sir E. Grey, 1011.

**Baines' Name Bill**
- *c. Rep.** *May. 14*, 766.
- 3R.* *May 23*, 1150.

**Balcarres, Lord** [Lancashire, Chorley]
- Committees, Scottish Grand, Procedure before—Verbatim Report, proposed, *Mar. 15*, 1035.
- Government Departments—Appointment of Committee to consider all Questions relating to Conditions of Employment, proposed, *May 16*, 1141.
- Halifax—Reason for Discontinuance of Grant to Salterhebble School, *May 29*, 1645.
- Irish Council Bill
  - Administrative Function under Clause 21 (2). *May 15*, 939.
  - Election Expenses, Provision of, *May 29*, 1647.
  - Powers of Lord-Lieutenant in regard to New Council, *May 16*, 1088.
- Leigh—Dog Licence Cases of T. Leigh and J. W. Lee, Decision given in, *May 28*, 1464.

**Balcarres, Lord**—*cont.*

Limited Partnerships Bill—Stamp Duty Clause inserted without Sanction of a Resolution in Committee — Recommittal of Bill, *May 15*, 1068.

New Hebrides, Female and Child Labour, Restrictions on Recruitment of, *May 14*, 786.

Parliamentary Procedure—Reverting to System of Dinner Hour, proposed, *May 15*, 1035, 1036.

Salonica—Position of Negotiations for Repayment of Ransom in Abbott Case, *May 15*, 955.

School Accommodation, Regulations as to, *May 29*, 1646.

Session—Proposals as to Duration of, *May 15*, 1036, 1037.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1555–1558.

Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1698–1704.

**Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.** [City of London]

Business of the House, Course of, *May 7*, 77; *May 13*, 643; *May* 14, 801.

Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 292, 293.

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 834–847, 850.

Fiscal Policy

Adaptation to present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 14*, 836–847.

Colonial Preference, Question of—Advantages offered by the Colonies, *May 14*, 834–836, 838, 845–847.

Protection, Advantages of, *May 14*, 836–841.

Imperial Conference, 1907—Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government towards, *May 14*, 835.

Income-tax Graduation, Necessity for *May 14*, 842, 843.

India

Bengal, Eastern — Disturbances in Myemsingh District, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with, *May 8*, 209.

Punjab Disturbances, Information as to, *May 13*, 615.

Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 96, 103–112, 117.

Land Values (Scotland) Bill, Intro., *May 13*, 649, 650.

Old-age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 14*, 841.

Taxation, Necessity for broadening Basis of, *May 14*, 842–845.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1487, 1488, 1507–1512, 1566.

**Balfour of Burleigh, Lord**

Companies Bill, *Rep.*, *May 14*, 758, 760, 761.

Destructive Insects and Pests Bill, 3R., *May 13*, 560–562, 563, 564.

**Ballinmore Bridge**

Muckland Farm and Cuskeydally, Cause of Disturbances at.

*Qs.* Mr. C. Craig, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 972, 973.

**Ballinskelligs Bay**

Trawling in — Protection afforded by “ Helga ” to Fisheries, etc.

*Qs.* Mr. Boland, Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 968, 969.

**Ballinspittle**

Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.

*Q.* Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 374.

**Ballintubber**

Outrage on Farm of Mr. Payne—Police Measures to deal with Situation.

*Qs.* Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *May 23*, 1165, 1166.

**Ballymoney**

Labourers' Cottage Scheme for Carnfinton, Inquiry into, proposed.

*Qs.* Mr. Glendinning, Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 975.

**Banbury, Sir F. G.** [London, City of]

Admiralty Beer Contracts, Allocation of, *May 9*, 351.

Aliens—Immigration Officers, Work done by, *May 16*, 1134.

Army, Territorial Force Organisation, Competency of Deputy-Lieutenants for, etc., *May 23*, 1159.

Government Property—Rates on Houses occupied by Foreign Representatives, *May 16*, 1116.

Gravesend Water-guard Inspector—Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16*, 1128.

Income-tax

Poor Rates, Copies of—Cost of Providing for Income-tax Purposes, *May 16*, 1142, 1143.

Returns—Declaration of Total Income, Objections to, *May 8*, 256–258.

Irish Council Bill

Election, Cost of and Charge for Expenditure, *May 15*, 937.

Second Reading, Date of taking, *May 23*, 1166.

[*cont.*

**Banbury, Sir F. G.**—*cont.*
- Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power), Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1268.
- Mint
  - Police, Charge for, *May 16*, 1117.
  - Wages, Salaries and Allowances, Increase in Estimate for, *May 16*, 1117.
- National Debt Office Salaries, Explanation of Increased Estimate for, *May 16*, 1119, 1120.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 495–501.
- Post Office
  - Contracts—Abandonment of Custom of accepting Lowest Tender, *May 9*, 3941.
  - Financial Position of, *May 9*, 394.
  - Pension and Superannuation System, Information as to, *May 9*, 395.
- Post Office Sites Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 278.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
  - Agricultural Commissioners
    - Limiting Expenses in connection with, to £5,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1365.
    - Salaries, Limiting Expenses in respect of, to £3,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1342.
  - Land Court, limiting Expenses in respect of, to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1351.
  - Salaries, Authorising Payment of out of Consolidated Fund, *May 24*, 1247–1250.
- Swine Fever Regulations, Inconvenience caused by, *May 23*, 1176, 1193.
- Telegraph Service
  - Boy Messengers, New Policy with regard to—Proposals as to Displacement of Ex-soldiers, *May* 9, 393, 394.
  - Scotland—Underground Wires, Progress made with laying, *May 9*, 392, 393.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 29*, 1718, 1729.
- Transvaal Loan—Objects to which applied, *May 16*, 1080.
- Vaccination Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1286–1290.

**Bann and Lough Neagh**
- Report by Mr. J. D. Bell, Presented, *May 27*, 1295; *May 28*, 1454.

**Baring, Mr. G.** [Isle of Wight]
- Army, Engineer Civil Staff, Position of—Proposals for Improvement, etc., *May 15*, 947, 948.

**Baring, Mr. G. V.** [Winchester]
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1534–1536.

**Barnes, Mr. J. N.** [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 677–683.
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government towards, *May 13*, 677, 678.
- Income-tax on Earned Incomes of less than £2,000 to be assessed at 9d. in the Pound, *May 13*, 679, 680.
- Old-age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 13*, 678–683.

**Barrie, Mr. H. T.** [Londonderry, N.]
- Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 158–162.
- Irish Education Act, 1892—Circular as to Disposal of Fines, *May 7*, 74.
- Labourers Act Fund, Sums transferred to, Information as to Investment, etc., *May 8*, 239.
- Land Values (Scotland) Bill, Cause for Delay in Printing, *May 29*, 1656.
- Licensing (Ireland) Act, 1902—Proposals for Renewal, *May 13*, 578.

**Barry, Mr. R.**—*Solicitor-General for Ireland* [Tyrone, N.]
- Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 178–183.

**Bath**
- Post Office in High Street, Lack of Public Accommodation in.
  - *Os.* Mr. Maclean, *May 9*, 413.

**Beach, Mr. M. Hicks** [Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury]
- Burwell Farm, Expenditure on, *May 7*, 71.
- Rural Districts, Depopulation of—Causes, Statistics, and Necessity for dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 331, 332.
- Small Holdings—Experiments with Crown Lands, *May 8*, 332.
- Taxation, Local—Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System, *May 8*, 274, 275.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 18*, 1528–1531.

**Beauchamp, Earl**
- Employment of Women Bill, 2R., *May 13*. 565.
- Factory and Workshop Bill, 2R., *May 14*. 735–739.
- Irish Tobacco Bill, 2R., *May 7*, 46.
- Union Jack Club, Controller of—Application for Appointment of Officer in the Indian Army, *May 16*, 1074.

**Beauchamp, Mr. E.** [Suffolk, Lowestoft]
- Naval Training of Boys—Hours spent at Sea by "Magnificent" and "Victorious," *May 16*, 1092.

**Beck, Mr. A. C.** [Cambridge, Wisbech]
Navy—*cont.*
Fruit Industry—Date of carrying out Recommendations of Committee of 1905, *May 23*, 1189.
Rural Districts, Depopulation of—Causes, Statistics, and Necessity for dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 321.

**Beet, Sugar**
*See* Sugar Beet.

**Beira**
Trade Report Presented, *May 16*, 1070.

**Belfast**
Cavehill Tramway, Circumstances of acquiring.
*Q.* Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May* 9, 340.
Dock Labourers' Strike, Disturbances in Connection with and Measures for Police Protection.
*Q.* Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1108.
Postal Mail Contracts to certain Places, Information as to.
*Q.* Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 966.

**Belfast Resident Magistrates Bill**
Facilities for Passage of.
*Qs.* Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1652.

**Bellairs, Mr. C.** [Lynn Regis]
German Naval Recruits, Age and Training of, *May 9*, 343.
Government Property, Rates on—Method adopted for Assessment, *May 16*, 1114.
Navy
"Ariel," Loss of—proposals for Inquiry, *May 9*, 343.
Dock Book—Date of Last Edition, etc., *May 28*, 1463.
Dockyards—Assessment of, Method adopted, *May 16*, 1114, 1115.
Foreign Navies, Number of British Seamen joining—Conditions of Service in Royal Fleet Reserve, *May 9*, 338.
Lyddite Shell
Manufacture at Ordnance Factories, Cause for and Percentage of Rejections, *May 13*, 608.
Tenders for—Allocation of Contracts at Woolwich, etc., *May 13*, 603.
Manœuvres, Proposals as to, *May 28*, 1467.
Nucleus Crews—Night Training at Sea, Information as to, *May 7*, 55.
Obsolete Vessels, Condition of Sale of and Proposals for utilising, *May 9*, 350.

**Bellairs, Mr. C.**—*cont.*
Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Armament of, *May 27*, 1306.
Torpedoes—Number manufactured in 1907 and Allocation of Contracts, *May 16*, 1092.
Port of London—Legislative Proposals for Provision of Dock, etc., *May 29*, 1643.
Woolwich Arsenal
Gun-mountings, Allocation of Contracts for, *May 13*, 611.
Inquiry, Scope of, *May 13*, 582.

**Belpatrick**
Farms, Sale Proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 596.

**Benn, Mr. W. W.** [Tower Hamlets, St. George's]
Army Pensions—Cases of H. Craig and S. Lisle, *May 9*, 348, 349; *May 24*, 1235.
Naval Pensions—Case of G. Day, *May 16*, 1083.

**Bennett, Mr. E. N.** [Oxfordshire, Woodstock]
Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, Responsibility of Great Britain, etc., *May 15*, 994–998.
New Forest, Poor Law Guardians, Relief granted by—Decision of Mr. Locke, etc., *May 28*, 1467.

**Berkhamsted**
Grammar School Scheme, Rights of Ratepayers under.
*Q.* Mr. Walrond; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *May 29*, 1621, 1622.

**Bethell, Mr.** [Essex, Maldon]
Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 501–503.

**Betting Circulars**
Transmission of, *see under* Post Office.

**Betting and Horse-racing**
State Taxation of, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Bottomley, *May 13*, 688, 689.

**Bills**
Government Proposals as to certain Measures.
*Qs.* Capt. Craig, Mr. W. Long, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Cleland, Mr. Clough, Sir J. Randles, Sir F. Channing; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 27*, 1333, 1334.

**Birmingham Corporation Bill**
*c. Rep.* May 9*, 333.
*Con.* May 13*, 566.
3R.* *May 23*, 1150.
*l.* Commons' Amendts., *Con.* May 29*, 1585.

**Birmingham Corporation Water Bill**
- c. 2R.* *May 13*, 567.

**Birr**
- Postmastership, Applications received for. *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 7*, 51.

**Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.**—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]
- Abbeylara—Reinstatement Claims of T. Reilly, P. Brady, and Alice Connor, *May 13*, 572.
- Agriculture Department
  - Constitution of Agriculture Board, Council of Agriculture and Technical Instruction Board, *May 15*, 977.
  - Funds at Disposal of, *May 15*, 974.
  - Meetings, Date of holding, *May 8*, 236.
  - Travelling Veterinary Inspector, Proposals for appointing, *May 8*, 238.
- Ancient Monuments—Number on Estates being sold under Act of 1903, *May 27*, 1301.
- Annagh Bogs, Ownership of, *May 8*, 229.
- Armagh Labourers' Cottage Loan, Reason for Delay in sanctioning, *May 15*, 937.
- Athenry
  - Caheroyan Grazing Tenants, Intimidation of, *May 15*, 971.
  - O'Halloran, Constable, Outrage on—Arrests made, etc., *May 15*, 970.
  - Outrage at House of T. Duddy, *May 29*, 1654.
- Ballinmore Bridge—Cause of Disturbance at Muckland Farm and Cuskeydaley, *May 15*, 972, 973.
- Ballinskelligs Bay, Trawling in—Services of "Helga," etc., *May 15*, 968, 969.
- Ballymoney—Inquiry into Carnfinton Cottages Scheme, proposed, *May 15*, 975.
- Belfast
  - Cavehill Tramway, Circumstances of acquiring, *May 9*, 340.
  - Postal Mail Contracts to certain Places, Information as to, *May 15*, 966.
- Belfast Resident Magistrates Bill, Facilities for Passage of, *May 29*, 1652.
- Belpatrick Farms, Sale Proposals for, *May 13*, 596.
- Blacklion—Allegations against Mr. Crozier, *May 16*, 1088.
- Blackwater Salmon Fisheries—Extension of Close Time, proposed, *May 29*, 1614.
- Boyle, Untenanted Lands, Conditions of Leasing and Rent received for, *May 28*, 1478.
- Browne Estate—Reinstatement Claims of J. Faley and W. Hennesay, *May 13*, 600.

**Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.**—*cont.*
- Burrowes Estate, Sale Proposals for, *May 8*, 227.
- Burrowes & Mayne, Messrs.—Police Knowledge of Whereabouts of Burrowes, *May 14*, 778.
- Carrignavar—Reinstatement Claim of J. O'Regan, *May 29*, 1615.
- Cavan
  - Land Appeal Cases—Date of giving Decisions, *May 7*, 54.
  - McDonald, Francis, Surcharge for Maintenance of, *May 13*, 596.
- Clogher—Farm of Mr. J. Martin, Sale proposals for, *May 10*, 468.
- Clooniskert—Outrage at Farm of B. O'Brien, *May 15*, 971.
- Cloontubbrid—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. O'Connor, *May 14*, 780.
- Condition of Ireland—Remarks of Mr. Justice Ross, etc., *May 29*, 1648.
- Congested Districts Board—Appointment and Duties of Mr. T. O'Rorke, *May 15*, 967.
- Conry Estate—Case of Mrs. Farrell, *May 10*, 469.
- Constabulary
  - Fund, Proposals for winding up, *May 9*, 349; *May 13*, 578.
  - Grazing Farm Disputes—Instructions as to making Arrests, *May 29*, 1653.
  - Invaliding from Injury while on Duty—Number of Cases during 1906, *May 13*, 597.
  - Recruits
    - Number in Training and Orders for Additional Enrolment, *May 29*, 1654.
    - Statistics for 1906 and 1907, *May 29*, 1650.
  - Reserve on 20th inst.—Number drafted into Disturbed Districts, etc., *May 29*, 1653.
- Coorheen—Raid on Houses of T. Glynn, M. Egan and G. Earkins, Arrests made, etc., *May 29*, 1654.
- County Surveyorships in Meath and Galway, Procedure in applying for, *May 13*, 598.
- Court Houses—Vesting in County Councils, proposed, *May 13*, 594.
- Cusack Estate—Case of T. Keenan, *May 10*, 469.
- Darnley Estate, Sale Proposals for, Case of J. Smith, *May 9*, 346.
- Derwana—Sale Proposals for Mrs. Acherson's Estate, *May 13*, 599.
- Deputy-Lieutenants—Return as to Names and Occupations, proposed, *May 10*, 467.

**Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.**—*cont.*

- Devolution Scheme of Lord Dunraven, Circulation of Copy of, proposed, *May 14*, 779.
- Dick Estate—Reinstatement Claim of H. Sorahan, *May 10*, 467.
- Dingle, Fair Rent Cases, and Arrangements for Hearing, *May 9*, 341.
- Dingle Harbour Improvements—Loan of Dredger, proposed, *May 8*, 229.
- Donegal—Fishery Rights off Congested Districts, New By-law as to, *May 14*, 777.
- Drainage, Arterial—Proposals for Circulating Appendix to Report of Commission, *May 8*, 205.
- Dunshaughlin Labourers' Cottages Scheme, Cause for Delay in issuing Loan, *May 9*, 339.
- Education
  - Intermediate Programme for 1908, Working of and Date of Publication, *May 8*, 231–235.
  - National School Teachers
    - Civil Rights—Decision as to Modification of Rules, *May 13*, 581.
    - Salaries over £70—Reason for paying to Certain Teachers, *May 8*, 203.
- Elphin United Irish League Meeting, Police Attendance at, etc., *May 15*, 967.
- English Government Departments and Authorities exercising Powers in Ireland, *May 16*, 1079.
- Evictions
  - Legislative Proposals for dealing with and Date of presenting Special Report, *May 13*, 595.
  - Reinstatement Claims, Result of Inquiry into, *May 29*, 1650.
- Fitzgate, Capt., Estate of—Reinstatement Claims of P. Callan and J. Wiseman, *May 9*, 340.
- Fitzwilliam Estate—Case of T. Whelan of Aghowle, *May 8*, 237.
- Forestry Department, Creation of, proposed, *May 13*, 597.
- Galway Poor Rate Collectors—New Arrangements as to Irrecoverable Arrears, *May 9*, 373.
- Glennamaddy, Grant for Relief of Distress in, *May 13*, 595.
- Grace, Lady, Estate of, Sale Proposals for, *May 13*, 579.
- Grazing Farms, Cattle driven off during May and Number receiving Police Protection, *May 8*, 238; *May 15*, 973, 974, 978; *May 29*, 1652, 1653.
- Inch East—Reinstatement Claim of B. Galvin, *May 14*, 780.

**Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.**—*cont.*

- Inchiquin, Lord, Estate of—Rent-recovery Proceedings, Allegations as to Threat of, *May 8*, 230.
- Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 78–103, 108, 143.
  - Administrative Function under Clause 21 (2), *May 15*, 939.
  - Annual Grant, Provision for, *May 13*, 581.
  - Departments not under Control of, Information as to—Expenditure on Land Purchase, etc., *May 14*, 779; *May 27*, 1304.
  - Eight Departments proposed to be dealt with
    - Annual Income of, etc., *May 14*, 779; *May 15*, 933, 937, 965; *May 27*, 1304.
    - Local Habitation of, *May 16*, 1087.
    - Powers and Duties of, *May 16*, 1087.
  - Election, Cost of and Charge for Expenditure, *May 15*, 937; *May 29*, 1647.
  - Electoral Divisions, Basis for Distributing, *May 15*, 933; *May 16*, 1089.
  - Financial Provisions, *May 15*, 976.
  - Irish Treasury, Proposals for Control of, *May 15*, 976.
  - Lord-Lieutenant, Powers of, in regard to New Council, *May 16*, 1088.
  - Privy Council Judicial Committee, Powers to be conferred on, *May 16*, 1087.
- Irvinestown — Reinstatement Claim of Francis Gallagher, *May 14*, 778.
- Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Scheme, Communication recently received as to, *May 15*, 973.
- Johnston Estate—Reinstatement Claim of J. O'Brien, *May 13*, 599.
- Kildysert, Malicious burning of Hay at—Prosecutions made, etc., *May 29*, 1649.
- Kilkenny, Evictions and Reinstatements, Information as to, *May 13*, 580.
- Kilmore—Demonstration against Mr. S. Russell, *May 15*, 969.
- Knocknacolon, Sale Proposals for, *May 9*, 347.
- Labourers' Act Fund, Sums transferred to—Information as to Investments, etc., *May 8*, 239.
- Land Commission
  - Church Temporalities Fund—Allocation of Surplus Income, *May 13*, *May 27*, 1302.
  - Commissioners, Names and Religion of, *May 13*, 602.

[*cont.*

**Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.**—*cont.*

- Land Judges Court—Sale of Estates, Procedure taken for, *May 8*, 226.
- Land Law (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill, Proposals as to, *May 29*, 1650, 1651.
- Land Purchase
  - Advances
    - Amounts granted, *May 29*, 1651.
    - Means of ascertaining Security for, in certain Cases, *May 8*, 226.
  - Annuities, Total Amount of, *May 27*, 1332.
  - Arrears, Proceedings Taken for Recovery of (1903-1907), *May 8*, 227.
  - Demesnes, Mansions, etc., Coming into Estates Commissioners' Hands since 1903, *May 9*, 345.
  - Drennan, Mr. J. T., Salary of, *May 9*, 348.
  - Grazing Farms Surrendered through Intimidation, Postponement of State Purchase of, proposed, *May 14*, 800.
  - Tenant Right, Procedure in Valuing, *May 8*, 228.
  - Transactions Effected, *May 29*, 1651.
- Lauder and Gumley Estate—Reinstatement Claim of J. Daly, *May 9*, 371.
- Law Courts—Proposals for Maintenance of Supreme Courts under New Scheme, *May 27*, 1303.
- Licensing (Ireland) Act, 1902, proposals for Renewal, *May 13*, 578.
- Local Authorities—Power to Accept Tenders not the Lowest Submitted, *May 9*, 337.
- Local Government
  - Appointments, Selection of Candidates for—Legislation to Prohibit Religious Pressure, proposed, *May 15*, 966.
  - Electors in each Parliamentary Constituency, *May 14*, 776.
- Lord-Lieutenant and Chief-Secretary, Powers of, as to Appointments and Dismissals in Certain Departments, *May 15*, 977.
- Lough Cutra—Sale proposals for Lord Gough's Property, *May 9*, 372.
- Loughrea—Disturbances at Certain Grazing Farms, Arrests made, etc., *May 15*, 970.
- Magistrates
  - Belfast and Dublin, Number in and Salaries of, *May 27*, 1332.
  - Kelly, P. J. Allegations against, *May 29*, 1649.
  - Return as to Previous Occupations, proposed, *May 10*, 467.
- Mevoo Grazing Land, Purchase proposals for, *May 13*, 600.

**Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.**—*cont.*

- Moonlighting Disturbances in Certain Districts—Arrests made by Police, etc., *May 13*, 582.
- Morley Estate, Purchase proposals for, *May 15*, 976.
- Mountshannon Estate
  - Reinstatement Claims of Evicted Tenants, *May 13*, 580.
  - Untenanted Lands, Disposal of, *May 16*, 1080.
- Mucklon—Cost of Police Protection of Hughes's Holding on 7th inst., *May 15*, 975.
- Newman Estate—Reinstatement Claim of T. Callaghan, *May 15*, 938.
- Newmarket-on-Fergus—Outrage at House of Caretaker Boland, *May 15*, 967.
- O'Rorke Estate, Sale proposals for, *May 13*, 595.
- Officials—Religious Opinions and Names of, *May 10*, 468.
- Ormathwaite Estate—Reinstatement Claim of T. Walsh, *May 14*, 771.
- Petty Sessions Courts, Rights of Chairmanship in, *May 13*, 598.
- Piers and Harbours
  - Grants since 1840, *May 14*, 781.
  - Harbours Reported on by Works Board, with Respect to Improving, *May 27*, 1300.
- Privy Council, Irish—Names, etc., of Members, *May 10*, 468; *May 14*, 778.
- Reenard Pier Construction, Decision as to, *May 15*, 966.
- Rinneen—Shooting Outrage on J. Murphy, *May 15*, 968.
- Roads, Maintenance of, when Altered by Construction of Railways, *May 29*, 1613.
- Roo Uneconomic Holdings—Proposals for Purchase of Untenanted Land, *May 9*, 373.
- Roscomroe, Grazing Farm Held by Mr. Luttrell—Measures taken by Police to Protect Cattle, *May 8*, 231; *May 29*, 1649.
- Saughton Estate—Reinstatement Claim of P. Collins, *May 7*, 50.
- Scott, Archdeacon, Estate of, Sale Proposals for, *May 9*, 347.
- Shillelagh Magistracy, Catholic Representation on and Allegations as to uncertain attendance, *May 9*, 236, 237.
- Shronowen—Reinstatement Claim of M. Mulvihill, *May 14*, 780.
- Swine—Irish Animals slaughtered for export, Scope of inspection, etc., *May 28*, 1478.
- Swinford, Poor Law Guardians, Charges against, *May 8*, 240.

**Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.**—*cont.*
Tralee, Constabulary Barracks, Telephone Extension to proposed, *May 15*, 939.
Westley Estate, Sale proposals for, *May 27*, 1305.
Westmeath, Untenanted land in Delvin and Mullingar districts, *May 13*, 594.
Wexford, County Council Grant, Deductions from (1900–1907), *May 27*, 1303.
Whitepark, Reinstatement Claim of J. Dann, *May 9*, 348.

**Births**
Certificate, Charges for—Procedure in applying under Factory and Workshops Acts.
*Q*. Mr. W. Johnson ; *A*. Mr. Burns, *May 15*, 944.

**Births and Deaths**
Registrars, remuneration of.
*Q*. Mr. Bridgeman ; *A*. Mr. Burns, *May 14*, 792, 793.

**Black, Mr. A. W.** [Bedfordshire, Biggleswade]
Rural Districts, Depopulation of—Cause, Statistics and Necessity for Dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 315.

**Blacklion**
Crozier, Mr., Allegations against.
*Q*. Mr. Courthope ; *A*. Mr. Birrell, *May 16*, 1088.

**Blackwater**
Salmon Fisheries—Extension of close-time proposed.
*Q*. Mr. Flynn ; *A*. Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1614.

**Board of Education Scheme (Hulme Trust Estates Educational) Confirmation Bill**
*c*. 1R.* *May 14*, 805.

**Boland, Mr. J. P.** [Kerry, S.]
Ballinskelligs Bay, Trawling in—Services of "Helga," etc., *May 15*, 968.
Cahirciveen Pier improvements, Decision as to, *May 15*, 960.
Reenard Pier construction, Decision as to, *May 15*, 966.
Warden Estate, Evicted tenants, cause for delay in Reinstatement of, *May 7*, 72.

**Borax Consolidated Bill**
*c*. *Rep.** *May 14*, 766.
3R.* *May 23*, 1150.

**Boston Spa Bill**
*l*. 2R.* *May 16*, 1069.

**Bottomley, Mr. H. W.** [Hackney, S.]
Betting and Horse-racing, State Taxation of, proposed, *May 13*, 688, 689.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 683–690.

**Bottomley, Mr. H. W.**—*cont.*
Income-Tax—Foreign Investments, Taxation of, proposed, *May 13*, 688.
Law Courts—Supreme Court of Judicature Clerks, number serving over forty years, *May 8*, 224.
Lotteries, Irish, Law as to, *May 15*, 979.
Motor Cars, Increased Taxation of, proposed, *May 13*, 688.
Old-Age Pensions
Government Proposals as to, *May 13*, 685–690.
Sum required to provide 5s. per week to all Persons over Sixty-five, *May 13*, 685, 686.
Post Office, Rule as to Transmission of Lottery Circulars, *May 9*, 362, 363.
Street Betting Act
Amendment to deal with Facilities afforded for Betting in Factories, proposed, *May 27*, 1320.
Effect of—Introduction of Amending Legislation, proposed, *May 13*, 634.
Wealth, Distribution of, *May 13*, 687.

**Bowerman, Mr. C. W.** [Deptford]
Cattle Importation Regulations, Effect of on work in Cattle Markets, etc., *May 23*, 1181.
Customs, Watchers, Overtime of, in 1906, *May 27*, 1298.
Deptford Victualling Yard, Hours of Labour and Holidays—Proposals as to Admiralty Visit, etc., *May 15*, 931.
London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 442–444.

**Bowles, Mr. G. S.** [Lambeth, Norwood]
Africa, East, Cotton Growing in—Government Subsidy to British East African Corporation, *May 15*, 950, 951.
Belfast Dock Labourers' Strike, Disturbances in connection with and Measures for Police Protection, *May 16*, 1108.
Clitheroe Women Weavers and the Dinner Hour—Alleged Statement by Inspector, *May 15*, 960.
Egypt—Assouan Dam, Raising of—Source of Payment of Cost and Firm entrusted with work, *May 7*, 62.
Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 712.
Post Office—Trade Orders, Reasons for New Regulations as to, *May 9*, 423.
Revenue and Expenditure—Amount raised by Taxes in 1906–7, *May 10*, 464.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, Operation of, *May 27*, 1330.

[*cont.*

**Bowles, Mr. G. S.**—*cont.*

Vaccination, Conscientious Objection to—Legislation to Assimilate Practice with that existing under Education Laws, proposed, *May 13*, 632.

**Boyle**

Untenanted Land held by Estates Commissioners, Disposal of—Proceedings of United Irish League.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1104, 1105.

Untenanted Lands, Conditions of Leasing and Rent received for.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 28*, 1478.

**Brackenhill Light Railway**

Order Presented, *May 14*, 734, 768.

**Brackey**

Post Office, Position of.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 13*, 587, 588.

**Bramsdon, Mr. T. A.** [Portsmouth)

Hilsea, War Office Land, Letting of, *May 16*, 1093.

Navy

Dockyard Writers, Effect of New Scheme on Pay and Promotion of, *May 14*, 782.

Portsmouth Dockyards

Chargemen of Labourers, Wages of, *May 8*, 204.

Date of Admiralty Visit to, *May 29*, 1621.

Post Office, Rule as to Redirection of Letters, *May 7*, 70.

**Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction**

*c.* 3R.* *May 7*, 47.
*l.* 1R.* *May 8*, 197.
2R.* *May 16*, 1069.

**Bridgeman, Mr. W. C.** [Shropshire, Owestry]

Baker Street and Waterloo Trains, Inadequate Accommodation in, *May 7*, 69.

Births and Deaths, Remuneration of Registrars of, *May 14*, 792.

Burwell Farm, Expenditure on, *May 7*, 71.

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 856–859.

Halifax—Reason for Discontinuance of Grant to Salterhebble School, *May 29*, 1643–1645.

Irish Grazing Farms under Police Protection on 1st instant, *May 7*, 73.

Land Purchase—Grazing Farms Surrendered through Intimidation, Postponement of State Purchase of, proposed, *May 14*, 799.

**Bridgeman, Mr. W. C.**—*cont.*

Old-Age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 14*, 857.

Taxation, Necessity for Broadening Basis of, *May 14*, 857–859.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 29*, 1730.

**Brighouse Corporation Bill**

*l.* 2R.* *May 15*, 921.

**Bright, Mr. J. A.** [Oldham]

Military Training in Schools—Compulsory Training in Secondary Schools, Proposals as to Grant for, *May 9*, 352.

**Bristol**

Mullers' Orphanage, Poor Law Children sent to.
*Q.* Sir A. Spicer; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 27*, 1296, 1297.

**Bristol Corporation Bill**

*l.* 1R.* *May 7*, 2.
2R.* *May 15*, 921.

**British Museum**

Reading Room, Re-decoration of—Contract, Stipulations as to Subletting and Piece Work.
*Q.* Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *May 13*, 640.

**Brixton**

Land Tax Commissioners, Meetings of.
*Q.* Mr. Seaverns; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 27*, 1296.

**Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum**

Vote for, *May 23*, 1227.

**Brockenhurst Gas Bill**

*l.* 2R.* *May 8*, 198.

**Brooke, Mr. G. S.** [Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley]

London Poor Law Guardians' Powers of Appointing Relief Committees, *May 15*, 961.

Navy

Midshipmen, Payment by, for Instruction, *May 27*, 1305.

Sailor's Kits, Free Grant of, proposed, *May 27*, 1305.

**Browne Estate**

Reinstatement Claims of J. Faley and W. Hennessy.
*Qs.* Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 600.

**Brunner, Mr. J. F. L.** [Lancashire, S.W.]

Railway Rates—Inclusion of Varnish among Dangerous Goods, Right of Appeal from Decision, etc., *May 13*, 635.

**Bryce, Mr. J. A.** [Inverness Burghs]
- Exchequer Bonds and Treasury Bills—Amount outstanding on 10th Inst., *May 13*, 631.
- India
  - Budget
    - Explanatory Memorandum — Place and Date of Preparation, *May 15*, 929.
    - Proposals as to taking—Date of Issue of Explanatory Memorandum, etc., *May 7*, 58, 59.
    - Statement, Date of Presenting, *May 15*, 929.
  - Moral and Material Progress—Date of Presenting Statement, *May 15*, 929.
- Postage, Foreign, Changes in, *May 9*, 391.
- Telegraph Service in Scotland—Progress made with laying Underground Wires, *May 9*, 392.

**Buchanan, Mr. T. R.**—*Financial Secretary to the War Office.* [Perthshire, E.]
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 29*, 1708, 1710, 1715, 1717, 1723.
  - Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1658–1659, 1704

**Building Trade**
- Employment Statistics for Recent Years. *Q.* Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 28*, 1466, 1467.

**Bull, Sir W. J.** [Hammersmith]
- Vaccination Bill—Proposals for Compensation for Vaccination Officers, *May 8*, 205.
- Vaccination, Officers, Alteration in Basis of Payment of, proposed, *May 15*, 943.
- Workhouses, Construction of—Code issued by Local Government Board, *May 15*, 943.

**Burke, Mr. F. H.** [King's County, Tullamore]
- Tullamore, Whisky Frauds—Decision in Case of Secretary to Company, *May 15*, 934.

**Burmah**
- State Prisoners, Particulars of—Return Ordered, *May 28*, 1463.

**Burnley Corporation Bill**
- *l.* 2R*., *May 15*, 921.

**Burns, Rt. Hon. J.**—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
- Birth Certificates, Charges for—Procedure in applying under Factory and Workshops Act, *May 15*, 944.
- Births and Deaths, Remuneration of Registrars of, *May 14*, 793.

**Burns, Rt. Hon. J.**—*cont.*
- Bristol — Poor Law Children sent to Muller's Orphanage, *May 27*, 1297.
- Building Trade—Employment Statistics for Recent Years, *May 28*, 1467.
- Camberwell Infirmary, etc., Cost of, *May 16*, 1100, 1101.
- Commons and Rights of Way—Cases in which Local Authorities have interfered under Act of 1894, *May 9*, 360.
- Education Rate, Decision as to Limit of, *May 14*, 793.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 686.
- Hammersmith, Workhouse and Infirmary at Wormwood Scrubbs, Cost of and Accommodation Provided in, *May 13*, 639, 640.
- Hartley Wintney School Accommodation—Decision as to Enlargement, *May 24*, 1233.
- Infant Mortality—Statistics as to certain Boroughs (1897–1906), *May 29*, 1616.
- Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 713–716.
- Local Government Board
  - Administrative Cost of (1903–6) and Amount paid to, in Relief of Local Taxation, *May 16*, 1101.
  - Messengers appointed since 1906, *May 15*, 945.
- London Poor Law Guardians' Powers of Appointing Relief Committees, *May 15*, 961.
- Metropolitan Water Board, Officials transferred, Conditions Imposed on, *May 15*, 943.
- Milk—Receipts from and Cost of Working Municipal Depots, *May 23*, 1154.
- Motors
  - Omnibuses, Emission of Smoke by—Penalty under Existing Acts, *May 9*, 362.
  - Speed Tests on Public Roads, Regulation of—Frome's Hill Case, *May 27*, 1324.
- New Forest Poor Law Guardians, Relief granted by—Decision of Mr. Locke, etc., *May 28*, 1467.
- Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 523–530.
- Paddington—Rating of West London Central Church, *May 9*, 361.
- Swindon Poor Law Guardian Sleeping one Night in Casual Ward and being declared as Disqualified thereby—Action proposed to be taken, *May 9*, 360.
- Taxation Local Returns, Expediting Publication of, proposed, *May 8*, 223.
- Tuberculosis—Recommendations of Roya Commission, Proposals for giving Effect to, *May 13*, 639.

[*cont.*

**Burns, Rt. Hon. J.**—*cont.*
Unemployed—Expenditure on Relief, *May 28*, 1475.
Vaccination Officers, Alteration in Basis of Payment of, proposed, *May 15*, 943.
Vaccination Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1275–1284.
  Compensation for Vaccination Officers Proposals for, *May 8*, 206.
  Statutory Declarations, Fees chargeable for, *May 7*, 68.
Valuation Bill—Proposals as to Introduction, *May 7*, 69.
Voters' Lists, Expenditure in Preparing—Power of Borough Council to Restrict Town Clerk, *May 8*, 223.
Water Supply in Rural Districts; Difficulty of Securing—Legislation to deal with Matter proposed, *May 9*, 361, 362.
West Ham Workhouse and Infirmary—Cost of Alcoholic Liquors consumed, (1905–7), *May 13*, 588.
Women's Service on Local Authorities—Proposals for Legislation, *May 13*, 638.
Workhouses, Construction of—Code Issued by Local Government Board, *May 15*, 944.

**Burrowes Estate**
Sale Proposals for.
  *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 226, 227.

**Burrowes and Mayne, Messrs.**
Burrowes, Police Knowledge of Whereabouts of.
  *Q.* Mr. Cogan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 778.

**Burwell Farm**
Expenditure on, Information as to.
  *Qs.* Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 7*, 71.

**Business of the House**
Course of.
  *Os.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 7*, 77; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 643; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 14*, 801; Mr. W. Long, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman *May 27*, 1335, 1336.
State of Proposals as to.
  *Os.* Mr. J. Ward, *May 15*, 1028–1030; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1032–1034.

**Butcher, Mr. S. H.** [Cambridge University]
Education
  Secondary
    Condition of, Lack of Facilities, etc. — Necessity for dealing with the Matter, *May 15*, 1064, 1066.
    Local Control—Extension of Principle to all Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, proposed, *May 15*, 1065, 1066.

**Butcher, Mr. S. H.**—*cont.*
Education—*cont.*
    Training Colleges, Abolition of Sectarian Tests in, proposed, *May 15*, 1064, 1065.

**Butter**
Danish Consignments originating in Siberia, Proposals for Preventing Contravention of Act, by.
  *Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 27*, 1325.

**Butter and Margarine Bill**
*c.* 2R., *May 8*, 280.
Second Reading, Date of Taking.
  *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 8*, 242.

**Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.**—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
Achill and Mulrany, Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 13*, 587.
Antrim Post Office—Application of T. Connolly for Transfer, *May 7*, 50.
Associations, Recognition as Trade Unions, *May 9*, 387.
Ballinspittle Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 9*, 374.
Betting Circulars, Transmission of through the Post, *May 9*, 380, 381.
Birr Postmastership, Applications received for, *May 9*, 51.
Blind Persons, Reduction of Postage on Literature for, *May 9*, 379, 380.
Brackey, Post Office, Position of, *May 13*, 588.
Cardonagh, Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 8*, 241.
Change, Regulations as to supplying to the Public, *May 9*, 412.
Contracts, Abandonment of Custom of accepting lowest Tender, *May 9*, 383, 416.
Cyprus—Postage on Letters and Postcards, *May 16*, 1085.
Dublin Telegraphists performing Overtime on 9th April, Reply to Representations from, *May 14*, 776.
Ealing Postal Facilities, Necessity for improvement in, *May 9*, 427.
Edinburgh Postal Telegraphists, Duties of, *May 15*, 931.
Employees, Conditions of Employment, Rate of Pay, etc., *May 9*, 382.
  Committee of Inquiry into, *May 9*, 384, 385.
Enniskillen Postal Communiation with Tempo, Improvement of, proposed, *May 13*, 587.

**Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.**—*cont.*

- Estimates—Allowance made for Depreciation in value of Buildings, etc., *May 29*, 1614.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 720–728.
- Financial Position and Reforms, etc.—Statement, *May 9*, 376–388.
- Fiscal Policy
  - Adaptation of to present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 13*, 722–728.
  - Manufactured Goods, 10 per cent. Tax on, *May 13*, 723, 726, 727.
- Garrison, Telegraph Extension to, proposed *May 13*, 589.
- Glasgow, Telephone Operators, Conditions of Transfer of, *May 8*, 224.
- Grangemouth, Telephone Service at, Reason for Removal of Trunk Exchange to Falkirk, etc., *May 9*, 415.
- Holloway Factory
  - New Policy as to Employment at, *May 9*, 384.
  - "Suggestion System," Adoption of, *May 9*, 384.
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government towards, *May 13*, 720, 721.
- Income Tax, Permanency of, at 1s. in the £, *May 13*, 724.
- India, Proposals as to Reduction of Telegraph Rates, etc., *May 9*, 428.
- Ireland
  - Revenue and Expenditure from Irish Business (1890–1906), *May 14*, 773.
  - Stores in—Selection of Staff for New Branch, *May 7*, 76.
- Kilkenny, Postal Communication with Castlecomer, Improvement of, proposed, *May 7*, 51.
- Letters
  - Deliveries in remote parts, Increase in Number of, *May 9*, 378.
  - Rule as to Redirection by Post Office, *May 7*, 70.
- Lewis, Island of—Stornoway Mail Service, Improvement of, proposed, *May 9*, 428.
- Lottery Circulars, Rule as to Transmission of, *May 9*, 363, 380, 381.
- Mail Cart Drivers—Increase in Wages and Provision of Uniform, for, *May 9*, 383, 415.
- Mail Service
  - Eastern Mail Packet Contract, New Arrangements for, *May 27*, 1325.
  - Hong Kong, Complaints as to Service with, *May 14*, 794.

**Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.**—*cont.*

- Mail Service—*cont.*
  - West Indian Subsidy, Proposals as to, *May 9*, 427.
- Money-lenders, Compelling Insertion of Names and Addresses on Envelopes used by, *May 9*, 427.
- Oban Post Office, Site for, *May 29*, 1643.
- Parcel Post to China—Arrangements for sending Registered Parcels, *May 27*, 1299.
- Permanent Officials, Criticisms on Policy of, *May 9*, 413, 414.
- Post Cards, Picture, Falling off in Revenue derived from, *May 9*, 376.
- Post Office Sites Bill, 1R., *May 8*, 278; 2R., 279.
- Postage
  - Foreign Postage, Changes in, *May 9*, 379.
  - Newspaper
    - Anomalies of Postal Rates, *May 9*, 428.
    - Canada, Reduction in Rates to, *May 9*, 379.
- Postal Orders
  - Irish Business, Transfer to Ireland proposed, *May 14*, 773.
  - Poundage on Lower Denominations, Reduction of, *May 9*, 378.
- Postmasterships—System of advertising Vacancies, *May 9*, 338.
- Relatives of Supervising Officials, Rule as to employing, Case of Telegraphist at Brighton, *May 10*, 463.
  - Date of Modifying Regulations, *May 16*, 1084.
- Savings Bank
  - Interest, Reduction in, to Prevent Deficiency, proposed, *May 13*, 592.
  - Irish Business
    - Transfer to Ireland proposed, *May 14*, 775.
    - Withdrawals during 1906, *May 14*, 773.
  - Telegraphic Withdrawals, Working of System, *May 9*, 427.
  - Unclaimed Balances, Amount of and Proposals for utilising, *May 15*, 942.
- Seniority, Loss of—Possibility of recovering by subsequent Good Service, *May 14*, 795.
- Smithfield Market Post Office Premises, Cause for Delay in improving, *May 10*, 463.
- Spain, Registered Letters not delivered in—Result of Inquiry, *May 14*, 775.
- Stamps, Automatic Machines for Supply of, *May 9*, 380.
- Taxation, Necessity for broadening Basis of, *May 13*, 721–728.

[*cont.*

**Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.**—*cont.*
  Telegraph Service
    Boy Messengers, New Policy with regard to—Proposals as to Displacement of Ex-soldiers, *May 9*, *8*, 385–387, 416.
    Clerical Duties, System of Instructing Telegraphists in, *May 8*, 204.
    Rural Districts, Increasing Facilities in, proposed, *May 9*, 416.
    Scotland—Underground Wires, Progress made with laying, *May 9*, 416–419, 428.
  Telegrams, Foreign and Colonial, Facilities for Transmission of by Steamer, *May 9*, 380.
  Telephone Service
    Charges, Excessive Nature of, *May 9*, 415.
    Effect of in superseding Telegrams and Letters, *May 9*, 376, 377.
    Extension, Progress made with, *May 9*, 377.
  Typists, Women, Increase in Salaries of, proposed, *May 9*, 414.
  Wireless Telegraphy Licences issued to British Companies—Date of Ratification of Convention, etc., *May 9*, 377.
  Workmen's Compensation Act, Insurance against—Facilities for effecting through the Post Office, *May 9*, 381.

**Byles, Mr. W. P.** [Salford, N.]
  Army Pensions—Inclusion of Aged Poor Soldiers not in Possession of Medal proposed, *May 29*, 1628.
  Juvenile Offenders, Treatment of—Extension of Reformatory System, *May 23*, 1226.
  Natal, Circumstances of Murder of Mr. Veal, *May 27*, 1314.
  Prisons
    Executive Boards, Appointment of Women on, proposed, *May 23*, 1225.
    Women Inspectors, Appointment of, proposed, *May 23*, 1225.
  Transvaal Mines—Strike of White Miners, Use of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 27*, 1312.

**Cabs**
  Privilege Cab System, Progress of Negotiations as to.
    *Qs.* Mr. Wiles, Mr. C. Money; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 9*, 357.
  Taximeter Cabs—Cause for Delay in, Sealing of Taximeters.
    *Q.* Mr. G. Clarke; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 24*, 1231, 1232.

**Cahirciveen**
  Pier Improvements, Decision as to.
    *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 960.

**Camberwell**
  Infirmary, etc., Cost of.
    *Qs.* Mr. Rees, Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. Burns, *May 16*, 1100, 1101.

**Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.** [Dublin University]
  Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 167–178.

**Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.** —*First Lord of the Treasury* [Stirling Burghs]
  Bills—Government Proposals for facilitating Passage of certain Measures, *May 27*, 1333, 1334.
  Business of the House
    Course of, *May 7*, 77; *May 14*, 801; *May 27*, 1335, 1336.
    State of and Proposals as to, *May 15*, 1032–1034.
  Butter and Margarine Bill—Second Reading, Date of taking, *May 8*, 242.
  Cattle, Importation Restrictions on Canadian Cattle, Removal of, proposed, *May 28*, 1465.
  Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Proposals as to, *May 8*, 242, 243.
  Committees
    Scottish Grand Committee
      Constitution of, *May 15*, 1034.
      Procedure before, Verbatim Report of, proposed, *May 15*, 1031, 1032.
    Standing Committee A — Circumstances of Adjournment on 13th inst., *May 14*, 801.
  Hague Conference—Discussion of Mining Operations in Territorial Waters, proposed, *May 13*, 601.
  Imperial Conference, 1907
    Emigration Agents, Payments to—Objections to Practice, *May 13*, 601.
    Irish Home Rule, Attitude towards, *May 8*, 214; *May 13*, 601.
    Proceedings, Proposals for Publication of, Dissatisfaction with Abridgements issued by Colonial Office, etc., *May 8*, 212, 213.
    Reports of Speeches, Responsibility for, *May 13*, 574.
  India
    Budget, Date of taking, *May 27*, 1334; *May 29*, 1656.
    Condition of—Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion, *May 15*, 981.
      Blocking Motion, Removal of, proposed, *Mvy 15*, 981, 982.

[*cont.*

**Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.** —*cont.*

Ireland, Condition of—Facilities for Parliamentary Discussion, etc., *May 15*, 979, 980.

Irish Council Bill

Course followed in Printing, *May 29*, 1656.

Grant, Scottish Contribution towards, *May 14*, 800.

Second Reading, Date of taking, *May 23*, 1166.

Land Legislation for England and Wales—Proposals for dealing with Hardships of Urban Tenants, *May 16*, 1111.

Land Purchase, Finance—Opportunity for Discussion, *May 14*, 771.

Land Values Scotland Bill, Cause for delay in Printing, *May 29*, 1656.

Marriages—Legislation to prevent Marriage of Persons with Hereditary Diseases, proposed, *May 8*, 242.

Moray Firth, Trawling—British Subjects in Subordinate Positions on Foreign Vessels, Reason for Prosecution of, *May 8*, 243, 244.

New South Wales Unimproved Land Value, Legislative Proposals for Rating, *May 14*, 801.

Parliamentary Elections—Legislative Proposals for dealing with Returning Officers' Fees, *May 16*, 111.

Post Office Mail Service—Scheme for All-British Route, *May 29*, 1656.

Session, Period for, *May 15*, 982, 1032–1034.

Small Holdings, Demand for and Supplies available—Tabling Evidence in Parliamentary Papers, proposed, *May 23*, 1166.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Extension of certain Provisions to England, proposals as to, *May 16*, 1091.

Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill—Facilities for Passage of, proposed, *May 3*, 601.

Surgeons, Royal College of—Reply to Memorial on Management, *May 13*, 602.

Unemployed Workmen Vote, Expenditure out of, *May 15*, 980.

Valuation (Scotland) Bill—Date of Introducing, *May 8*, 204.

**Camperdown, Earl of**

Destructive Insects and Pests Bill, 3R., *May 13*, 563, 564.

House of Lords Reform Proposals—Government Attitude towards Select Committee of Inquiry, *May 13*, 537.

**Canada**

[*See also names of States as* British Columbia]

Cattle, *see that title.*

Customs Duty on Produce of United Kingdom, Alterations in since 1897.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 576.
*Qs.* Mr. P. Pease, Sir G. Parker, Mr. C. Money; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 629, 630.

Postage on Periodicals, *see* Post Office—Postage.

Steamship Lines to—Effect of New Scheme for Subsidised Line, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1313.

Tariff Arrangements with certain Foreign Countries—Effect on British Trade, etc.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 23*, 1154.

**Canterbury, Archbishop of**

Factory and Workshop Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 739–744.

House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 7*, 3–9.

**Cardiff Railway Bill.**

*c.* Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *May 7*, 47.

**Carlile, Mr. E. H.** [Hertfordshire, St. Albans]

Africa, East—Telegram sent by Colonial Secretary to Commissioner in Grogan case, Date of, *May 13*, 619.

Agriculture Board

Appropriations-in-aid, Reason for reduction of, *May 23*, 1210.

Experimental Research, increased expenditure on and Advantages of, *May 23*, 1210.

Map-Mounters, Reason for Appointment of, *May 23*, 1203.

Ballintubber—Outrage on Farm of Mr. Payne, and Police Measures to deal with Situation, *May 23*, 1165, 1166.

Halifax

Copley School, Accommodation in, *May 16*, 1085.

Salterhebble School, Reason for Discontinuance of Grant to, *May 29*, 1644.

Kew Gardens—Rate of Pay of Gardeners, *May 23*, 1209, 1210.

Rifle Clubs—Army Rifles Unsuitable for Conversion, Issue of, proposed, *May 13*, 605, 606.

Swine Fever, Increase in Expenditure in connection with, *May 23*, 1210.

**Carndonagh**
Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. O'Doherty; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 8*, 241.

**Carrignavar**
Reinstatement Claim of J. O'Regan.
*Q.* Mr. W. Abraham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1615.

**Carrington, Earl**—*President of the Board of Agriculture*
Destructive Insects and Pests Bill, 3R., *May 13*, 562, 563, 565.

**Cartridges**
Seizure at Newcastle—Sentence on J. Hogarth.
*Q.* Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 16*, 1085.

**Castlefrench**
Farm of J. Burns, Outrage at—Measures for Protection of Tenants of Grazing Farms, etc.
*Qs.* Capt. Craig, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1109, 1110.

**Castlereagh, Viscount** [Maidstone]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 29*, 1727, 1730, 1731.

**Cattle**
Importation Regulations
Effect of on Work in Cattle Markets and price of meat, etc.
*Qs.* Dr. Cooper, *May 23*, 1178–1181, 1203; Mr. Bowerman, 1181; Mr. Jackson, 1182; Sir F. Channing, 1184; Mr. E. Gardner, 1187; Sir E. Strachey, 1194–1201, 1203.
Restrictions on Canadian Cattle
Removal of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Mond; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 28*, 1465.
Speech of Sir W. Laurier, etc.
*Qs.* Sir F. Cawley; Mr. J. Wason; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 13*, 640–641.
Irish Exports to Great Britain during 1906.
*Q.* Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1106.

**Cavan**
Land Appeal Cases—Date of Giving Decisions.
*Q.* Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 7*, 54.
McDonald, Francis, Surcharge for Maintenance of—Resolution as to Remission.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 595, 596.

**Cavan**—*cont.*
Railway Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 13*, 589.

**Cave, Mr. G.** [Surrey, Kingston]
Kew Gardens
Assistant Director, Reason for Appointment of, *May 23*, 1206.
Gardeners, Rate of Pay of, *May 23*, 1206.
London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 27*, 1413.
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 295.
Vaccination Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1274.

**Cavehill and Whitewell Tramways Bill**
*l.* Bill not to be further Proceeded with, *May 13*, 533.

**Cavendish, Rt. Hon. V. C. W.** [Derbyshire, W.]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 29*, 1707, 1710, 1716, 1721–1722.
Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1670–1673.
Financial Arrangements in—proposals for Referring Paper 3370 to Public Accounts Committee, *May 29*, 1629.

**Cawdor, Earl**
Destructive Insects and Pests Bill, 3R., *May 13*, 564.

**Cawley, Sir F.** [Lancashire, Prestwich]
Cattle, Live, Importation of—Speech of Sir W. Laurier, etc., *May 13*, 640, 641.
Korea—Allegations as to Subsidy on Japanese Cotton Goods, *May 16*, 1098.
Tonkin Railways—Arrangements for Conveyance of British and French Goods, *May 14*, 788.

**Cecil, Lord R.** [Marylebone, E.]
Income Tax Act, 1842—Effect of Clause 28 and Third Schedule of Finance Bill upon Section 133, *May 13*, 630.
Llanelian Schoolmaster, Decision as to Payment of Salary of, *May 7*, 69.
Post Office Sites Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 279.

**Cecil, Mr. E.** [Aston Manor]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 672–677.
Fiscal Policy—Industries of the Country, Effect of Free Trade System on, *May 13*, 673, 674.
Imperial Conference, 1907—Preferentia Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government Towards, *May 13*, 674–677.
Taxation, Necessity for Broadening Basis of, *May 13*, 672, 673.

**Chairman**
- Civil Service Estimates
  - Matter Irrelevant to Vote Under Discussion, *May 16*, 1119, 1139.
  - Motions for Reductions of Votes, Procedure as to, *May 23*, 1202, 1204.
- Matter Irrelevant, *May 9*, 395, 405, 422.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
  - Amendment, Effect of Closure Resolution on, *May 24*, 1265, 1266.
  - Financial Resolution
    - Matters Relevant to Discussion, *May 24*, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1248, 1249, 1250, 1253, 1254, 1255, 1256, 1264.
    - Omission of First Resolution in Putting the Question, Allegations as to, *May 24*, 1268.

**Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.** [Worcestershire, E.]
- Armaments, Expenditure on, Possibility of Reducing, *May 13*, 655.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 651–665, 668, 670, 723.
- Fiscal Policy
  - Adaptation to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 13*, 651, 654–658, 664.
  - Industries of the Country, Effect of Free Trade System on, *May 13*, 664.
- Imperial Conference, 1907
  - Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government towards, *May 13*, 663.
  - Results of Negotiations, Lack of Adequate Information, etc., *May 13*, 662.
- Income Tax—Earned Incomes of less than £2,000 to be Assessed at 9d. in the Pound, *May 13*, 659–661.
  - Pensions and Annuities, Position of, *May 13*, 660.
- Merchant Shipping—Effect of Change in Fiscal System, *May 13*, 670.
- National Debt — Capital Borrowings, Amount allocated to Payment of Interest and Annuities, *May 13*, 668.
- Old Age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 13*, 657, 658.
- Revenue and Expenditure
  - Financial Position of the Country, Necessity for Strengthening, *May 13*, 653, 654.
  - Statistics of Expenditure for 1846, 1849, 1880–1886, 1895 and 1907–8, *May 13*, 656.

**Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A.**—*cont.*
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Land Court, Limiting Expenses in respect of, to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1356–1359.
- Taxation
  - Basis of, Necessity for Broadening, *May 13*, 651–654, 659.
  - War Taxes, Possibility of remitting, *May 13*, 662.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 29*, 1723–1725, 1730.
  - Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1659, 1681, 1682, 1684–1690.
- Wealth, Distribution of, *May 13*, 652.

**Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster**
*Rt. Hon. Sir A. Fowler.*

**Chancellor of the Exchequer**
*Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.*

**Channing, Sir F. A.** [Northamptonshire, E.]
- Anthrax, Result of Scientific Experiments and Inquiries, *May 23*, 1186.
- Cattle Importation Regulations, Effect of, *May 23*, 1184.
- Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, Responsibility of Great Britain, etc., *May 15*, 999–1001.
- Liquor Traffic—Legislative Proposals of the Government, *May 27*, 1334.
- Old Age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May*, 477–483.
- Railways, Engines running Tender First, Danger Involved by, *May 15*, 945.
- Rural Districts, Depopulation of
  - Causes of, Statistics as to and Necessity for Dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 317.
  - Tariff Reform as a Remedy, *May 8*, 317.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1485.
- Tuberculosis—Recommendations of Royal Commission, *May 13*, 639.

**Charities**
[*See also names of Counties*]
- Agricultural Land—Return as to Acreage, etc., Presented, *May 9*, 336.
- Vote for, *May 16*, 1148.

**Charity Commissioners**
- Sale of Charity Lands, Policy as to, and Influence of Members of Parliament on—Case of St. Mary's Hospital, Chichester.
  - *Q.* Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. A. Trevelyan, *May 13*, 575, 576,

**Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.**—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Liverpool Exchange]

- Abbeyleix—Boycotting of Jackson, Dunne, and Draper—Protection afforded by Police, etc., *May 7*, 73.
- Ballintubber—Outrage on Farm of Mr. Payne and Police Measures to deal with Situation, *May 23*, 1165, 1166.
- Belfast Dock Labourers Strike, Disturbances in connection with and Measures for Police Protection, *May 16*, 1108.
- Boyle Untenanted Land held by Estates Commissioners, Disposal of—Proceedings of United Irish League, *May 16*, 1105.
- Castlefrench — Outrage at Farm of J. Burns, *May 16*, 1109, 1110.
- Cattle—Irish Exports to Great Britain during 1906, *May 16*, 1106.
- Dundrum—Erection of Bridge proposed, *May 16*, 1107.
- Ennisnag—Reinstatement Claim of R. Reddy, *May 7*, 73.
- Fintown—Charges against Boyle McMonagle and Moy, *May 13*, 571.
- Gort Rural District Valuations—Power of Galway County Council to refuse to give list of Ratepayers asking for revision, *May 16*, 1107.
- Grazing Farms
    - Disturbances in Connection with Letting—Change of Venue in Trials, etc., *May 29*, 1655.
    - Number under Police Protection on 1st instant, *May 7*, 74.
- Irish Education Act, 1892—Circular as to Disposal of Fines, *May 7*, 74.
- Kellet's Estate, Purchase Proposals for, *May 16*, 1109.
- Kilmore—Demonstration against Mr. S. Russell, *May 16*, 1110.
- King's County—Particulars of Incendiary Fires during last six months, *May 16*, 1106.
- Lambert Minors Estate—Grass Lands cleared of Stock, Proceedings taken by Police, etc., *May 16*, 1111.
- Lotteries, Irish, Law as to, *May 15*, 979.
- Sligo County Council Printing Contract, Decision of Local Government Board Auditor as to, *May 7*, 76.
- Warden Estate, Evicted Tenants, Cause for delay in Reinstatement of, *May 7*, 72.

**Chief Secretary for Ireland**

*Right Hon. A. Birrell.*

**Children**

- Poor Law, *see that title.*
- Public Houses, Infants taken to, *see under* Liquor Traffic.

**China**

- Opium, *see that title.*
- Trade Report Presented, *May 28*, 1451.

**Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.**—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Manchester, N.W.]

- Africa, Central—Grant-in-Aid for Education, *May 27*, 1313.
- Africa, East
    - Cotton-growing, Conditions of Government Assistance to, *May 8*, 215, 216.
        - British East African Corporation, Government Subsidy to, *May 15*, 951.
    - Grogan Case — Telegram sent by Colonial Secretary to Commissioner, date of, *May 13*, 619.
    - Nairobi Prison
        - Cost of and date of Completion, *May 7*, 61.
        - Using for all European Prisoners instead of Mombasa, proposed, *May 28*, 1469.
    - Senoussi Movement, Allegations as to Spread of, *May 13*, 623.
    - Steamship Communication with—Proposals for Encouragement of British Lines, *May 29*, 1635.
- Africa, West
    - Deep Water Landing Places, Ownership of, *May 9*, 355.
    - Rails and Sleepers, Arrangements for Shipping, Freight charged, etc., *May 9*, 353, 354; *May 23*, 1161.
    - Volta District, Trade with—Effect and Incidence of Canoe Tax and Salt Tax, *May 8*, 216.
- Canada
    - Steamship Lines to—Effect of New Scheme for Subsidised Lines, etc., *May 27*, 1313.
    - Tariff Arrangements with certain Foreign Countries—Effect on British Trade, *May 23*, 1154.
- Congo Free State
    - British Consular Staff in Upper Congo, Independent Means of Communication, possessed by, *May 29*, 1640.
    - British Subjects residing in, *May 29*, 1640.
- Crown Agents for the Colonies, Advantages of retention, *May 9*, 353.
- Hague Conference — British Delegates' Powers as to signing of Conventions, etc., *May 29*, 1639.
- Imperial Conference, 1907
    - *Daily Mail* Report of incident of 14th instant, Veracity of, *May 15*, 953, *May 16*, 1097.

[*cont.*

**Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.**—*cont.*
Imperial Conference, 1907—*cont.*
Entertainment of Colonial Ministers, Provision of Cost of—Designation of Premiers as Guests of the Nation or the Government, *May 29*, 1635.
Preference, Colonial Policy as to—Offers made by Premiers to admit British Goods on Special Terms, *May 13*, 623.
Proceedings, Proposals for publication of — Dissatisfaction with Abridgements issued by Colonial Office, etc., *May 8*, 211, 212.
*Précis*, Publication of and Responsibility for making, *May 13*, 621; *May 16*, 1098.
Publication *in extenso*, Decision as to, *May 13*, 622.
Publicity, Discussion on, Proposal as to Printing, *May 29*, 1636.
Report, Date of Issue of, *May 23*, 1162.
Verbatim Report, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1098.
Jamaica
Earthquake—Decision as to Government Grant, *May 8*, 218.
Swettenham, Sir A.—Censure by Lord Elgin, Offer made to withdraw, *May 8*, 214.
Natal
British Indians, Trading Licences of —Complaints as to Administration of Law, *May 12*, 620.
Dinuzulu, Visit of, Allegations as to Disloyalty, etc., *May 29*, 1639.
Gumede, Mr. J., Cause for arrest of, *May 16*, 1097.
Veal, Mr., Circumstances of Murder of, *May 27*, 1315.
New Hebrides
Female Labour under Age—Estimate of Number Available for Employment, *May 8*, 217.
Female and Child Labour, Restrictions on Recruitment of, *May 14*, 785, 786.
Nigeria
Indians from the Punjab, Appointments Resigned by, etc., *May 27*, 1314.
Northern — Decision as to Railway, *May 8*, 215.
Railway Material — Procedure in Placing orders for Freight, *May 9*, 354.
Opium
Anti-opium Movement in China, Progress made with, *May 27*, 1316.

**Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.**—*cont.*
Opium—*cont.*
Chinese Proposals for Restricting Traffic—Memorial from Shanghai Traders, etc., *May 29*, 1639, 1640.
Cure tried in Malay States, Value of, *May 27*, 1315.
Good Health and Immunity from Fever conferred by Moderate use of — Allegation in Report of Central Africa Commissioner, *May 23*, 1163.
Indian Trade with China—Reply to Chinese Proposals, *May 27*, 1316.
Orange River Colony Constitution—Date of Granting Letters Patent, *May 15*, 1024.
Panama Canal
Labourers from British Possessions, Records kept and Measures for Protection of, *May 13*, 619.
Trinidad Labourers, Conditions of Employing, *May 7*, 60.
Post Office Mail Service — All British Scheme, Coaling of Ships, Provisions as to, *May 23*, 1162.
St. Helena, Condition of, and Government Proposals for Assisting Emigration, *May 14*, 787.
St. Lucia Riots, Information as to, *May 8*, 216.
Salonica—Negotiations for Repayment of Ransom in Abbott Case, *May 27*, 1317.
Sarawak—Brooketon Collieries, Decision as to Taxing, *May 13*, 620, 621.
Shanghai Municipal Gaol, Cause for Objections to Confinement in, *May 27*, 1317.
Smyrna, Brigandage near—Effect of Abbott Case, *May 27*, 1317.
Swaziland
Cession of Portion to Transvaal, Negotiations for, *May 15*, 939.
Policy as to—Changes Contemplated in Order of December 1906, *May 15*, 952.
Transvaal
British Indians, Conditions of Registering, *May 7*, 61.
Chinese Labour
Opium, Conditions of Obtaining, *May 23*, 1163.
Policy of the Colonial Government, *May 15*, 953, 954.
Repatriations Effected and Payment of Expenditure, *May 15*, 952, 953; *May 16*, 1080.

[*cont.*

**Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.**—*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*

Chinese Labour—*cont.*

Unlicensed Coolies Position and Measures taken to Deal with, *May 13*, 624; *May 15*, 1021–1024.

Cost of Repatriating, *May 16*, 1080.

Distress in Rural Districts, Allegations as to and Proposals for dealing with, *May 13*, 623, 624.

Loan

Date on which Guarantee was Promised to General Botha, *May 15*, 954.

Objects to which applied, *May 16*, 1080.

Proposals for Granting, *May 9*, 355.

Mines—Cause of Strike of White Miners, *May 8*, 218; *May 13*, 625.

Imperial Troops, Necessity for Employment of, *May 27*, 1309–1311; *May 29*, 1636–1638.

Trinidad—Port of Spain Town Commissionership, Qualifications for, *May 7*, 60.

West Indies, British Naval Vessels for Service in—Decision as to Additional Cruiser, *May 8*, 217.

Zambesi—Victoria Falls, Conditions of Concessions made at, *May 14*, 784–785.

**Civil Service**

Boy Clerks, Reply to Memorial from. *Q.* Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 14*, 798.

Promotions from the Ranks opposed by the Treasury during the last five Years. *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 940.

Superannuation, *see that title.*

**Civil Service Estimates**

Board of Agriculture and Fisheries and Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew—£77, 840, *Com.*, *May 23*, 1167.

Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum, £24, 128, *Com.* May 23*, 1227.

Customs Department—£608,700, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1120.

Exchequer and Audit Department—£39,400, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1116.

Government Property, Rates, etc.—£348, 700, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1112.

Inland Revenue Department—£1,469,300, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1142.

**Civil Service Estimates**—*cont.*

Ireland

Dublin Metropolitan Police, Salaries, etc.—£36,985, *Rep.* May 23*, 1228.

Hospitals and Miscellaneous Charitable Allowances—£139, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1148.

Local Government Board—£46,411, *Rep.* May 23*, 1228.

Office of Public Works, Salaries, etc.—£24,568, *Rep.* May 23*, 1228.

Mint, including Coinage—£41, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1117.

Miscellaneous Charitable, and other Allowances—£368, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1148.

National Debt Office—£8,153, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1119.

Post Office and Telegraphs, Salaries and Expenses—£11,117,751, *Com.*, *May 9*, 375.

Prisons—£407,605, *Com.*, *May 23*, 1211.

Reformatory and Industrial Schools—£127,105, *Com.* May 23*, 1227.

Superannuation and Retired Allowances—£373,400, *Com.*, *May 16*, 1148.

Supplementary Amount required for Sundry Colonial Services—Estimate Presented, *May 9*, 335.

**Clare**

County Council Grants, Deductions from. *Q.* Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 9*, 374.

**Clark, Mr. G.** [Belfast, N.]

English Government Departments and Authorities exercising Powers in Ireland, *May 16*, 1079.

Irish Council Bill—Eight Departments proposed to be dealt with, Annual Income of, etc., *May 15*, 937.

**Clarke, Mr. C. G.** [Camberwell, Peckham]

Taximeter Cabs—Cause for Delay in sealing of Taximeters, *May 24*, 1231.

**Cleland, Mr. J. W.** [Glasgow, Bridgeton]

Customs and Excise Bonded Premises—Penalties inflicted on Sureties for Irregularities, *May 24*, 1235; *May 27*, 1300.

Keiss School Teacher, Cause for Dismissal of, *May 28*, 1477.

Liverpool Bonded Warehouses for Deposit of Wines and Spirits, Number of and Arrangements for taking Charge of, *May 27*, 1297.

Tullamore Whisky Frauds—Decision arrived at, *May 27*, 1300.

Valuation (England) Bill, Proposals as to, *May 27*, 1334.

**Clitheroe**
Women Weavers and the Dinner-hour—Alleged Statement by Inspector.
*Qs.* Mr. Bowles; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 15*, 960.

**Clogher**
Farm of Mr. J. Martin, Sale Proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 10*, 468.

**Clooniskert**
Outrage at Farm of B. O'Brien, Cause of and Summonses issued.
*Qs.* Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 970, 971.

**Cloontubbrid**
Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. O'Connor.
*Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 780.

**Clough, Mr. W.** [Yorks, W.R., Skipton]
Education
Board, Constitution of—Date of last Meeting, etc., *May 14*, 796, 797.
Rate, Decision as to Limit of, *May 14*, 793.
School Nomenclature, New Proposals as to, *May 9*, 365.
Education (Local Authority Default) Act, 1904–Occasions for putting into Operation, *May 14*, 797.
Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill, Proposals as to, *May 27*, 1334.
Skipton Schools, Nomenclature of, *May 9*, 364.

**Clyde Ports**
Vessels entering, *see* Merchant Shipping—Statistical Return.

**Clynes, Mr. J. R.** [Manchester, N.E.]
Customs and Excise — Naval Officers, Proposals for appointing to Superior Positions in Customs Staff, *May 7*, 53.

**Coal**
Export Tax on, Advantages of.
*Os.* Mr. Harwood, *May 14*, 888, 889.

**Coal Mines**
Eight-hour Day—Report of Committee Presented, *May 16*, 1070, 1077.
Hours of Labour, Inquiry into—Date of issuing Report.
*Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 14*, 790.
Welsh-speaking Inspectors, Decision as to.
*Os.* Mr. Rees, *May 23*, 1177.

**Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill**
Committee, Constitution of, Evidence taken by and Date of issuing Report.
*Q.* Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 13*, 574.
Proposals as to.
*Qs.* Mr. Markham; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 8*, 242, 243.
*Qs.* Mr. Glover, Mr. Fenwick; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 28*, 1473, 1474.

**Cochrane, Mr. T. H.** [Ayrshire, N.]
Crofters' Holdings to which Act has been applied—Fair Rents Fixed, etc., *May 27*, 1330.
Juvenile Offenders, Treatment of—Extension of Reformatory System, *May 23*, 1224.
Prisons
Dietary, Alleged Inadequacy of, *May 23*, 1223, 1224.
Governors, Policy of appointing Naval and Military Officers, *May 23*, 1223.
Warders—Housing within the Precincts of Prisons, proposed, *May 23*, 1225.
Women Inspectors, Appointment of, proposed, *May 23*, 1223.
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 295.
Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1292.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
Expenditure by Authorities set up by the Bill, Provisions as to, *May 24*, 1252–1257.
Land Court, Limiting Expenses in respect of to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1354.
Staff, Estimated Requirements and Cost, *May 24*, 1255–1257.

**Cocoa**
Duties, Anomalies in and Proposals for Revision.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 24*, 1232.

**Cogan, Mr. D. J.** [Wicklow, E.]
Burrowes and Mayne, Messrs.—Police Knowledge of whereabouts of Burrowes, *May 14*, 778.

**Coinage and Currency**
Mint, *see that title.*

**Collings, Rt. Hon. J.** [Birmingham, Bordesley]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 748–732.
Fiscal Policy—Adaptation to present condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 13*, 728–732.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1387, 1421–1428.

**Collins, Mr. S.** [Lambeth, Kennington]
Customs Statistical Branch—Annual Leave of Assistant Clerks (New Class), *May 9*, 343.

**Collins, Sir W. J.** [St. Pancras, W.]
Japan—Qualifications of Medical Officers to British Embassy at Tokio, *May 14*, 787.
Surgeons, Royal College of—Reply to Memorial on Management, *May 13*, 601.

**Colloony, Ballina and Belmullet Railway and Piers Bill**
c. *Rep.* May 9*, 333.
*Con.* May 13*, 566.
3R.* *May 16*, 1075.
*l.* 1R.* *May 16*, 1069.

**Colonial Conference, 1907**
*See* Imperial Conference.

**Colonial Office**
*Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
*Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. W. L. S. Churchill.

**Colonies and Protectorates**
(*For* particular Colonies, etc., *see their names*).

**Committees**
Scottish Grand Committee
Constitution of.
*Os.* Mr. Pirie, *May 15*, 1026, 1027; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1034.
Procedure before, Verbatim Report of, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. A. Taylor, *May 15*, 1030, 1031; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1031, 1032 Lord Balcarres, 1035.
Standing Committee A—Circumstances of Adjournment on 13th inst.
*Qs.* Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 14*, 801.

**Commons and Rights of Way**
Cases in which Local Authorities have interfered to protect under Act of 1894.
*Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 9*, 360.

**Companies**
Unclaimed Dividends notified in Balance Sheets, Measures for payment of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 28*, 1472.

**Companies Bill**
*l.* *Rep., May 14*, 749.
3R., *May 16*, 1071.
c. 1R.* *May 16*, 1112.
*Debates on Report* [Lords] *May 14*, 749; Third Reading, *May 16*, 1071.
Auditors, Notice of Change of, to be sent to all Shareholders and Retiring Auditors not less than Seven Days before the Annual General Meeting, 755, 756.
Clause 17, Amendments to, 750–754.
Consolidation of Companies Act by means of a Bill, 1071, 1072.
Copy of part of Register, Regulations as to obtaining, Fee for, etc., 1072.

**Companies Bill**—*cont.*
*Debates on Report*—cont.
Debentures
Deposit of to Secure an Advance, no such Debenture to be invalidated by such Action, 751, 752.
Redeemed Debentures, Provisions as to re-issue of, 749, 750.
Re-issue of, Stamp Duty to be paid on, etc., 1071.
Extraordinary Resolutions to be Filed with Registrar in like manner as Special Resolutions—New Clause, 758.
Increase of Nominal Amount of Shares when Unregistered Companies are Registered as Limited Companies, Provision as to, 1073.
Liquidators failing to File a Return showing Date of Final Winding-up, Penalty to be imposed on, 1072.
Mortgages and Charges, Exemption of Scotland from Provisions as to, proposed, 758–760.
No Preference or Special Privilege attached to any Class of Shares, to be interfered with except by a Resolution passed by Shareholders of that Class, etc., 757.
Penalty for Refusal by Director or Officer of a Company to allow Inspection of Register of Mortgages, 749.
Reconversion of Stock into Shares, Notice to be given to Registrar, 1072.
Reduction of Capital and Liability of Shareholders, 1073.
Schedule, Third, Enactments specified in, 1072.
Section 7 of Act of 1879, Repeal of, 1073.
Third Reading, Date of taking, 761, 762.

**Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill**
Inquiry—Inclusion of Scottish Representative, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 8*, 221.

**Congested Districts Board (Ireland)**
O'Rorke, Mr. T. Appointment and Duties of.
*Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 966, 967.

**Congested Districts Board (Scotland)**
Report, Date of Presenting.
*Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 16*, 1103.

**Congo Free State**

Belgian Administration, Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives—Responsibility of Great Britain, etc.
*Os.* Sir J. Kennaway, *May 15*, 984–986; Sir C. Dilke, 986–990; Earl Percy, 991–994; Mr. Bennett, 994–998; Mr. P. Pease, 998; Sir F. Channing, 999–1001; Mr. Nolan, 1001–1005; Mr. G. White, 1005–1009; Mr. Rees, 1009; Sir E. Grey, 1011–1016.

Belgian Annexation, Official Information as to Proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 13*, 627.

Effect on Lado Enclave.
*Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 28*, 1471.

British Consular Staff in Upper Congo, Independent Means of Communication possessed by.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1640.

British Subjects Residing in.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1640.

**Conry Estate**

Farrell, Mrs., Case of—Interest charged on Agreements.
*Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 10*, 469.

**Consols**

Amount of 2½ per cent. Consols in May, 1906 and 1907.
*Q.* Mr. Straus; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 957.

Government Purchases for Redemption Purposes, Proposals as to.
*Q.* Mr. Straus; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 27*, 1317, 1318.

**Constabulary, Royal Irish**

[*See also names of places*]

Fund, Proposals for winding-up.
*Qs.* Mr. Duffy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 349; *May 13*, 597, 598.

Grazing-Farm Disputes—Instructions as to making Arrests.
*Q.* Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1653.

Invaliding from Injury while on Duty—Number of Cases during 1906.
*Q.* Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 596, 597.

Recruits

Number in Training and Orders for Additional Enrolment.
*Q.* Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1653, 1654,

Statistics for 1906 and 1907.
*Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell *May 29*, 1649, 1650.

**Constabulary, Royal Irish**—*cont.*

Reserve on 20th inst.—Number drafted into Disturbed Districts, etc.
*Q.* Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1653.

**Conveyancing Bill**

*c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 804.

**Cooper, Dr. G.** [Southwark, Bermondsey]

Cattle Importation Regulations, Effect of on Work in Cattle Markets and Price of Meat, *May 23*, 1178–1181, 1203.

**Coorheen**

Raid on Houses of T. Glynn, Mr. Egan, and G. Earkins—Arrests made, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr Birrell, *May 29*, 1654.

**Corbett, Mr. T. L.** [Down, N.]

Ballinmore Bridge—Cause of Disturbance at Muckland Farm and Cuskeydally, *May 15*, 972, 973.

Belfast Postal Mail Contracts to certain places, Information as to, *May 15*, 966.

Condition of Ireland—Facilities for Parliamentary Discussion, etc., *May 15*, 980.

Imperial Conference, 1907—Veracity of *Daily Mail* Report of Incident of 14th inst., *May 16*, 1097.

Irish Works Board, and System of Appointing Clerks in—Allegations against Sir R. Holmes, *May 8*, 240.

Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Scheme, Communication recently received as to, *May 15*, 973.

Laundries—Legislative Proposals for Inspection, *May 15*, 959.

New Hebrides—Female and Child Labour, Restrictions on Recruitment of, *May 14*, 786.

Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 516.

Rural Districts, Depopulation of—Causes, Statistics, and Necessity for dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 316.

Standing Committee A—Circumstances of Adjournment on 13th inst., *May 14*, 801.

**Cornwall**

Charitable Trusts applied to Elementary Education Purposes—Report Presented, *May 24*, 1231; *May 28*, 1451.

**Cornwall, Duchy of**

*Lord Warden*—Earl of Ducie.

**Cornwall, Sir E. A.** [Bethnal Green, N.E.]

London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 27*, 1409–1413.

**Corsica**

Trade Report Presented, *May 13*, 534.

**Cotton**
- English Trade—Amount paid per Week in Wages.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 8*, 221, 222.

**Cotton, Sir H. J. S.** [Nottingham, E.]
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Circumstances of Attendance of Sir J. Mackay, *May 8*, 211.
- India
  - Bengal, Eastern — Disturbances in Mymensingh District, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with, *May 8*, 209, 210.
  - Budget
    - Date of taking, *May 27*, 1334.
    - Time to be allotted to, *May 29*, 1655.
  - Flogging as Judicial Punishment—Reply to Despatch, *May 27*, 1312.
  - Punjab
    - Disturbances, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with, *May 13*, 617, 618.
    - Land Colonisation Bill, Tabling Copy of, proposed, *May 29*, 1630.
- Opium
  - Anti-opium Movement in China, Progress made with, *May 27*, 1316.
  - Indian
    - Calcutta Sales, Price at, *May 27*, 1300.
    - Trade with China—Reply to Chinese Proposals, etc., *May 27*, 1316.
- Post Office Mail Service—New Arrangements for Eastern Mail Packet Contract, *May 27*, 1324.
- Shanghai Municipal Gaol, Reason for Objections to Confinement in, *May 27*, 1316.
- Transvaal, British Indians, Conditions of registering, *May 7*, 61.

**Courthorpe, Mr. G. L.** [Sussex, Rye]
- Africa, East—Condition of Government Assistance to Cotton Growing, *May 8*, 215.
- Army
  - Billeting of Soldiers, Authority responsible for Arrangements as to, *May 8*, 208.
  - Officers — Appointments offered to Supernumerary Majors of disbanded Infantry Battalions, *May 23*, 1159.
  - Rifles—Date of Completion of Conversion of Number mentioned in Estimates, *May 8*, 208.
- Athenry—Outrage at House of T. Duddy, *May 29*, 1654.

**Courthorpe, Mr. G. L.**—*cont.*
- Blacklion—Allegations against Mr. Crozier, *May 16*, 1088.
- Butter and Margarine Bill—Date of taking Second Reading, *May 8*, 242.
- Coorheen, Raid on Houses of T. Glynn, M. Egan, and G. Earkins, Arrests made, etc., *May 29*, 1654.
- Cyprus—Postage on Letters and Postcards, *May 16*, 1035.
- Education—Regulations as to School Accommodation, *May 29*, 1645, 1646,
- Hops Act of 1866
  - Administration of, Reason for Non-application of to Foreign Hops, *May 23*, 1168–1175, 1202; *May 29*, 1646.
- London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 429–432.
- Marines, Royal, Report on, Date of completing and Proposals for Tabling, *May 28*, 1468.
- Militia—Inducements to join Special Contingent, *May 16*, 1089.
- Police, Metropolitan, Increase in Numbers and weekly Day of Rest, Proposals as to, *May 29*, 1640, 1641.
- Redhill—Decision in case of F. T. Hemsley, *May 8*, 221.
- Swinford, Poor Law Guardians, Charges against, *May 8*, 239.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 29*, 1708.
- Volunteers
  - Retired—Conditions of joining Territorial Force, *May 16*, 1090.
  - Special Contingent, Inducements to join, *May 16*, 1089.

**Courtney, Lord**
- House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 7*, 29–31.

**Coventry Corporation Water Bill**
- *l.* Report from Select Committee, *May 13*, 533.
  - 3R.* *May 28*, 1449.
- *c.* 1R.* *May 29*, 1611.

**Cox, Mr. H.** [Preston]
- Death Duties—Revision of Scale, *May 8*, 268.
- Imperial Conference, 1907
  - *Précis* of Proceedings, Publication of and Responsibility for making, *May 13*, 621.
  - Preference, Colonial Policy as to—Offers made by Premiers to admit British Goods on Special Terms, *May 13*, 622.

**Cox, Mr. H.**—*cont.*
- Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 483–495.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Expenditure by Authorities set up by the Bill, Provisions as to, *May 24*, 1244, 1245.

**Craig, Captain J.** [Down, E.]
- Agriculture Department, Funds at Disposal of, *May 15*, 974.
- Belfast Resident Magistrates' Bill, Facilities for Passage of, *May 29*, 1652.
- Boyle Untenanted Land held by Estates Commissioners, Disposal—Proceedings of United Irish League, *May 16*, 1104; *May 28*, 1478.
- Castlefrench—Outrage at Farm of J. Burns, *May 16*, 1109, 1110.
- Cattle—Irish Exports to Great Britain in 1906, *May 16*, 1106.
- Condition of Ireland
  - Facilities for Parliamentary Discussion, etc., *May 15*, 979, 980.
  - Remarks of Mr. Justice Ross, etc., *May 29*, 1648.
- Dundrum Bridge, Erection of, proposed, *May 16*, 1106, 1107.
- Empire Day—Hoisting of Flag on War Office, proposed, *May 16*, 1092, 1093.
- Grazing Farms
  - Cattle driven off, during May, and Number receiving Police Protection, *May 29*, 1652.
  - Disturbances in connection with letting—Change of Venue in Trials, etc., *May 29*, 1655.
- Hospitals in Ireland, Grants to, *May 16*, 1148.
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Publication of Proceedings *in extenso*, Decision as to, *May 13*, 622.
- Irish Council Bill
  - Discussion, facilities for, *May 13*, 643.
  - Eight Boards proposed to be dealt with
    - Payments by, etc., *May 15*, 965.
    - Powers and Duties of, *May 16*, 1086.
  - Second Reading—Date of taking, *May 27*, 1333.
- Kilmore—Demonstration against Mr. S. Russell, *May 16*, 1110.
- King's County—Particulars of Incendiary Fires during last Six Months, *May 16*, 1105.
- Lambert Minors Estate—Grass Lands cleared of Stock, Proceedings taken by Police, etc., *May 16*, 1110.
- Land Purchase
  - Advances—Amounts granted, *May 29*, 1651.

**Craig, Capt. J.**—*cont.*
- Land Purchase—*cont.*
  - Annuities, Total Amount of, *May 27*, 1332.
  - Transactions effected, *May 29*, 1651.
- Local Government Appointments, Selection of Candidates for—Legislation to prohibit Religious Pressure, proposed, *May 15*, 965.
- Magistrates in Belfast and Dublin—Number and Salaries, *May 27*, 1331, 1332.
- Mucklon—Cost of Police Protection of Hughes's Holding on 7th inst., *May 15*, 974.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Limiting Expenses in Respect of Land Court, to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1359, 1360.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1564; *May 29*, 1715, 1719, 1720, 1731, 1732.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour
  - Policy of the Colonial Government, *May 15*, 952.
  - Repatriations effected and Payment of Expenditure, *May 15*, 952, 953.
- Unemployed Workmen Vote, Expenditure out of, *May 15*, 980.

**Craig, Mr. C. C.** [Antrim, S.]
- Athenry—Caheroyan Grazing Tenants, Intimidation of, *May 15*, 971.
- Ballinmore Bridge—Cause of Disturbance at Muckland Farm and Cuskeydally, *May 15*, 972.
- Clooniskert—Outrage at Farm of B. O'Brien, *May 15*, 970, 971.
- Constabulary
  - Grazing Farm Disputes—Instructions as to making Arrests, *May 29*, 1653.
  - Recruits—Number in Training and Orders for Additional Enrolment, *May 29*, 1653.
  - Reserve on 20th instant—Number drafted into Disturbed Districts, etc., *May 29*, 1653.
- Grazing Farms under Police Protection, *May 15*, 973, 974.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour—Policy of the Colonial Government, *May 15*, 952.

**Craik, Sir H.** [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
  - Expenditure by Authorities set up by the Bill, Provisions as to, *May 24*, 1245–1247.
  - Land Court, limiting Expenses in respect of to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1349.
- Vaccination Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1285.

**Crean, Mr. E.** [Cork, S.E.]
  Ballinspittle Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 9*, 374.
  Saughton Estate—Reinstatement Claim of P. Collins, *May 7*, 50.

**Cremer, Mr. W. R.** [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
  Russian Social Democrat Conference—Allegations as to Police Espionage, *May 27*, 1319.

**Criminal Appeal Bill**
  *c.* 2R., *May 8*, 282.
  Cases likely to be submitted to Court and probable Cost.
    *Q.* Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 13*, 590.
  Clause 12, Increase of Staff necessitated by and Estimate of Cost entailed.
    *Qs.* Mr. Rawlinson; *As.* Sir J. Walton, *May 27*, 1328, 1329.
  *Debate on Second Reading* [Commons], *May 8*, 282.
    Cost of Appeal, 282, 285, 286, 289.
    Judicial Staff for Purposes of, Proposals as to, 285, 286.
    Re-trial of Cases, Provisions as to, 284, 288–292.
    Right given to any Criminal to appeal on any Point of Law arising at the Trial, 282, 283, 287.
    Shorthand Notes of Trial, Expense involved by, 282, 285.
    Unworkable Nature of the Measure, 283.

**Criminal Procedure**
  Petitions on behalf of Convicted Persons received in Home Office during 1905.
    *Q.* Mr. A. Douglas; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 13*, 590.

**Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Acts**
  Extensions and Amendments proposed—Copy ordered, *May 14*, 770; Presented, *May 24*, 1231.

**Crombie, Mr. J. W.** [Kincardineshire]
  Telegraph Wires underground, Progress made with laying, in Scotland, *May 9*, 402, 403.

**Crooks, Mr. W.** [Woolwich]
  Glasgow Telephone Operators, Conditions of transfer of, *May 8*, 224.
  Government Property—Rates on Houses occupied by Foreign Representatives, *May 16*, 1116.
  Local Government Board Pension System—Case of Senior Assistant Clerk, *May 16*, 1100.
  London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 453.
  Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 517 520.

**Crooks, Mr. W.**—*cont.*
  Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 299.
  Public Demonstrations, Employment of Police in regulating, *May 15*, 959.
  Russian Social Democrat Conference—Allegations as to Police Espionage, etc., *May 27*, 1320.
  Woolwich Arsenal
    Admiralty Contracts Allotted to, *May 13*, 611.
    Discharged Workmen—Authority for giving Advice as to Emigration, *May 13*, 607.
    Gun-Mountings, Allocation of Contracts for, *May 13*, 611.
    Labourers' Wage, Minimum of, *May 16*, 1091.

**Cross, Mr. A.** [Glasgow, Camlachie]
  Bazaar Raffles, Legality of, *May 9*, 371.
  Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 281.
  Income Tax
    Collection—Assimilating English and Scotch Systems, proposals as to, *May 8*, 258–260.
    Three Years Average System, Working of, etc., *May 7*, 65, 66.
  Rosyth, Price Paid for—Names of Valuators, etc., *May 7*, 56.
  Scottish House-Letting System, Inquiry into—Date of Presenting Report, *May 9*, 369; *May 14*, 799.

**Crown Agents for the Colonies**
  Advantages of Retention.
    *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 9*, 353.

**Crown Lands**
  Letting, Arrangements for.
    *Q.* Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 14*, 771.

**Cuba**
  Fowler & Co., Messrs.—Claim Against the Spanish Government.
    *Q.* Mr. Seaverns; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 27*, 1296.

**Culloden Estate**
  Evictions on—Policy of Government as to Scottish Leaseholders, etc.
    *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 27*, 1331.

**Cumberland**
  Police Promotion System, Legality of.
    *Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 8*, 220.

**Cusack Estate**
  Keenan, T., Case of.
    *Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 10*, 469.

*May* 7—*May* 29.

**Customs and Excise**
Abstractor Clerks, Claims of.
*Os.* Mr. C. Hay, *May 16*, 1142.
Cost of Customs Collection on Preferential Basis for Certain Goods.
*Q.* Mr. Mond; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 28*, 1472.
First-class Examining Officerships of Customs, Examinations for, since 1891.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 14*, 798.
Naval Officers, proposals for Appointing to Superior Positions in Customs Staff.
*Q.* Mr. Clynes; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 7*, 53, 54.
Out-door Staff, Conditions of Service of.
*Os.* Mr. Pickersgill, *May 16*, 1131–1133; Mr. J. M. Robertson, 1133, 1134; Mr. Hart-Davies, 1135; Mr. Stewart, 1135; Mr. W. Rutherford, 1137; Mr. Runciman, 1140.
Promotion System in Customs Department.
*Q.* Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 9*, 341, 342.
Reserve Soldiers and Sailors, Number Employed.
*Os.* Viscount Turnour, *May 16*, 1136, 1137; Mr. Runciman, 1139.
Statistical Branch
Annual Leave of Assistant Clerks (New Class).
*Q.* Mr. S. Collins; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 9*, 343.
Conditions of Service of Assistant Clerks.
*Os.* Mr. Seaverns, *May 16*, 1138, 1140; Mr. Runciman, 1140.
Subscriptions Collected or Promoted by Superior Officers of Customs among Subordinates, Rule as to.
*Q.* Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 15*, 945, 946.
Sureties for Bonded Premises, Penalties Inflicted on for Irregularities—Particulars given in Annual Reports.
*Qs.* Mr. Cleland; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *May 24*, 1235; *May 27*, 1300.
Vote for, *May 16*, 1120.
Increase due to Increments of Salaries.
*Q.* Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 941.
Watchers, Overtime of, in 1906.
*Q.* Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 27*, 1298.

**Cyprus**
Postage on Letters and Postcards, Inequality in.
*Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 16*, 1085.

**Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops Act**
Councils who have made Regulations under—Return Presented, *May 13*, 570.

**Dairying Industry**
Regulation of, Necessity for.
*Os.* Mr. E. Gardner, *May 23*, 1187, 1188.

**Dalmuir**
Railway Fatality at Level Crossing—Erection of Bridge proposed.
*Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 27*, 1323.

**Dalziel, Mr. J. H.** [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Transvaal Loan, proposals for Granting, *May 9*, 355.

**Darnley Estate**
Sale proposals for—Case of J. Smith.
*Q.* Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 346.

**Davies, Mr. T.** [Fulham]
South Kensington Museum—Late Free Night on Thursdays, proposed, *May 29*, 1646.

**Death Duties**
Revision of Scale.
*Os.* Mr. H. Cox, *May 8*, 268.
Resolution Reported, *May 8*, 267, 268.

**Delany, Mr. W.** [Queen's County, Ossory]
Agriculture Department, Travelling Veterinary Inspector, proposals for Appointing, *May 8*, 238.
Drainage, Arterial—Proposals for Circulating Appendix to Report of Commission, *May 8*, 205.
Land Purchase—Salary of Mr. J. T. Drennan, *May 9*, 348.
Lincolnshire, Crime in—Condition of Brigg Division, *May 8*, 220.
Works Board, Ireland, System of Appointing Clerks in—Allegations against Sir R. Holmes, *May 8*, 240.

**Denbigh, Earl of**
Sugar Beet
Brussels Convention, Adherence to Essential for Success of Sugar Beet Industry, alleged, *May 13*, 548–550.
Cultivation in British Isles—Establishment of Manufactories, Question of Remitting Excise Duty, etc., *May 13*, 545–551.
Tobacco, Cultivation in Ireland—Government Assistance towards, *May 13*, 546, 551, 554.

**Denman, Lord**
Sugar Beet
Brussels Convention, Adherence to Essential for Success of Sugar Beet Industry, alleged, *May 13*, 553, 554.

[*cont.*

**Denman, Lord**—*cont.*
Sugar Beet—*cont.*
Cultivation in British Isles—Establishment of Manufactories, Question of Remitting Excise Duty, etc., *May 13*, 551–556, 558.
Tobacco, Cultivation in Ireland—Government Assistance towards, *May 13*, 554, 558.

**Derelicts at Sea**
*See under* Merchant Shipping.

**Derwana**
Sale proposals for Mrs. Achesons' Estate·
*Q.* Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 599.

**Destructive Insects and Pests Bill**
*l.* Report from Standing Committee, *May 7*, 3.
3R., *May 13*, 560.

**Devlin, Mr. J.** [Belfast, W.]
Belfast—Cavehill Tramway, Circumstances of acquiring, *May 9*, 340.
Fitzgate, Capt., Estate of, Reinstatement Claims of P. Callan and J. Wiseman, *May 9*, 339.
Merchant Shipping Bill
Counsel, proposal for Hearing at Committee Stage, *May 7*, 52.
Cross-Channel Steamers, Exemption of, proposed, *May 7*, 52.

**Devonshire, Duke of**
House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 7*, 9–16.

**Dewar, Mr. A.** [Edinburgh, S.]
Edinburgh Postal Telegraphists, Duties of, *May 15*, 930.
Telegraph Service—Clerical Duties, System of Instructing Telegraphists in, *May 8*, 204.

**Dewar, Mr. J. A.** [Inverness]
Inverness-shire Sanatorium — Interdict Granted against Parish Council of Boleskine and Cleertart, *May 14*, 799.
Lobsters, Close Time for—Reply to Memorial from Scottish West Coast Fishermen, *May 13*, 642.
Whale Killing, Nuisance caused by—Effect on Herring Fishery, etc., *May 9*, 369.

**Dick Estate**
Reinstatement Claim of H. Sorahan.
*Q.* Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr Birrell, *May 10*, 467.

**Dickinson, Mr. W. H.** [St. Pancras, N.]
Local Taxation Returns, Expediting Publication of, proposed, *May 8*, 222.
London County Council (Electric Supply), Bill, 2R, *May 9*, 454–458.
Voters Lists, Expenditure in Preparing—Power of Borough Councils to Restrict Town Clerk, *May 8*, 223.

**Dickson-Poynder, Sir J.** [Wilts, Chippenham]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1523–1525.

**Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W.** [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]
Congo Free State, Belgian Administration, Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, Responsibility of Great Britain, *May 15*, 986–990.
Indian Budget, proposals as to Taking—Date of Issue of Explanatory Memorandum, etc., *May 7*, 59.
Swaziland, Policy as to—Changes Contemplated in Order of December, 1906, *May 15*, 952.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1481–1483, 1489, 1491, 1528; *May 29*, 1727.
Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1660–1670.

**Dillon, Mr. J.** [Mayo, E.]
Constabulary, Invaliding from Injury while on Duty—Number of Cases during 1906, *May 13*, 596.
Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 140.

**Dinas Powis**
School, Condition of.
*Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. Lough, *May 28*, 1475.

**Dingle**
Fair Rent Cases, Arrangements for Hearing.
*Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 341.
Harbour Improvements—Loan of Dredger proposed.
*Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 228, 229.

**Diplomatic and Consular Service**
Estimate for Consular Service, Reason for Increase in.
*Q.* Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 956, 957.

**Diseases of Animals Act (1896) Amendment Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 804.

**Dockyards, Naval**
*See under* Navy.

**Dolan, Mr.** [Leitrim, N.]
Deputy-Lieutenants, Ireland, Return as to Names and Occupations, proposed, *May 10*, 467.
Derwana, Sale proposals for Mrs. Acheson's Estate, *May 13*, 599.
Garrison, Telegraph Extension to, proposed, *May 13*, 588.
Irvinestown, Re-instatement Claim of Francis Gallagher, *May 14*, 778.
Johnson Estate—Re-instatement Claim of J. O'Brien, *May 13*, 599.

**Donegal**
Fishery Rights off Congested Districts, New By-law as to.
*Q.* Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 777.

**Donoughmore. Earl of**
Soldiers, Teaching of Trades while in the Army, proposals as to, *May 29*, 1606.

**Doughty, Sir G.** [Great Grimsby]
Moray Firth, Trawling in
British Subjects in Subordinate Positions on Foreign Vessels, Reason for Prosecution of, *May 8*, 243, 244.
Foreign Vessels Reported and Number with British Crews, *May 8*, 225.

**Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. A.** [Kent, St. Augustine's]
Criminal Procedure, Petitions on Behalf of Convicted Persons Received in Home Office during 1905, *May 13*, 590.

**Dublin**
Metropolitan Police, Vote for, *May 23*, 1228.
Telegraphists Performing Overtime on April 9, Reply to Representations from.
*Q.* Mr. McNeill; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 14*, 775, 776.
Valuation, Progress made with.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 27*, 1332.

**Duckworth, Mr. J.** [Stockport]
Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 505–507.

**Dudley and District Light Railway**
Order Presented, *May 14*, 734, 769.

**Duffy, Mr. W. J.** [Galway, S.]
Constabulary Fund, proposals for Winding-up, *May 9*, 349; *May 13*, 579.
Galway Poor Rate Collectors—New Arrangements as to Irrecoverable Arrears, *May 9*, 373.
Gort Rural District Valuations—Power of Galway County Council to Refuse to give List of Ratepayers asking for Revision, *May 16*, 1107.
Lough Cutra, Sale proposals for Lord Gough's Property, *May 9*, 372.
Roo, Uneconomic Holdings—proposals for Purchase of Untenanted Land, *May 9*, 372.

**Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill**
*l.* 3R.* *May 29*, 1585.

**Duncan, Mr. C.** [Barrow-in-Furness]
Kew Gardens, Rate of Pay of Gardeners, *May 23*, 1206, 1209.

**Duncan, Mr. R.** [Lanark, Govan]
Navy—Obsolete Vessels, Conditions of Sale of, and Proposals for Utilising, *May 9*, 350.
Scottish House-Letting System, Inquiry into—Date of Presenting Report, *May 14*, 798.
Sewage Purification, Systems Adopted by Scottish Burghs, *May 14*, 770.

**Dundee**
Telegraphists' Grievances.
*Os.* Mr. Wilkie, *May 9*, 404.

**Dundrum**
Bridge, Erection of, proposed.
*Qs.* Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1106, 1107.

**Dunshaughlin**
Labourers Cottages Scheme—Cause or Delay in Issuing Loan.
*Q.* Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 339.

**Durham**
Polling Districts, Order Altering, Presented, *May 16*, 1070, 1077.

**Durness**
Steamboat Service with Thurso, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 28*, 1477.

**Ealing**
Postal Facilities, Necessity for Improvement in.
*Os.* Mr. Nield, *May 9*, 425; Mr. Buxton, 427.

**Edalji Case**
Compensation, Decision as to.
*Qs.* Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 28*, 1473.
Papers Presented, *May 16*, 1070, 1077.
Report of Committee, Proposals for Tabling.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 13*, 634, 635.

**Edinburgh**
Postal Telegraphists, Duties of.
*Q.* Mr. A. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 15*, 930, 931.

**Education, Board of**
*President*—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
*Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. T. Lough.
Constitution of, Date of Last Meeting, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 14*, 796, 797.
Medical Department, Proposals for Establishing.
*Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 15*, 962.

[cont.

**Education, Board of**—*cont.*
Medical Officers, Duties, etc., of.
*Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 16*, 1102.
Special Reports (North of Europe) Presented, *May 27*, 1295; *May 28*, 1451.

**Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 13*, 534.

**Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Survey, etc.) Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 13*, 534.

**Education (England and Wales)**
[*For* particular places, *see their names.*]
Absence through Illness, Effect of, on Grant.
*Q.* Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Lough, *May 28*, 1476.
Code, Date of Circulating and Opportunity for Discussion.
*Qs.* Sir F. Powell; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *May 15*, 962.
Grants from Consolidated Fund or Out of Revenue (1901–1905).
*Qs.* Mr. P. White; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *May 16*, 1101.
Medical Inspection of Schools, Proposals for.
*Q.* Viscount Valentia; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 9.*
*Qs.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. Wedgwood, 344; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *May 9*, 363, 364.
Issue of Memorandum of Suggestions proposed.
*Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* McKenna, *May 16*, 1101, 1102.
Rate, Decision as to Limit of.
*Q.* Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 14*, 793.
Schools
Accommodation—Regulations as to Area for each Child.
*Qs.* Mr. Courthope, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *May 29*, 1645, 1646.
English (excluding Monmouthshire)—List Presented, *May 23*, 1152; *May 28*, 1451.
Summary of Figures and Memorandum for Secondary Schools Presented, *May 27*, 1295; *May 28*, 1451.
Expenditure by Local Authorities on Provision of since 1870.
*Q.* Mr. Armitage; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 8*, 202.
Nomenclature, New Proposals as to.
*Q.* Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 9*, 365.
Wales and Monmouthshire—Schools in which do or do not receive Assistance from Rates.
*Q.* Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 14*, 797, 798.

**Education (England and Wales)**—*cont.*
Secondary
Condition of, Lack of Facilities, etc.—Necessity for Dealing with the Matter.
*Os.* Mr. Silcock, *May 15*, 1037–1039; Mr. Adkins, 1039–1046; Sir P. Magnus, 1046–1050; Mr. Shackleton, 1050–1052; Mr. McKenna, 1052–1056; Sir W. Anson, 1056–1061; Mr. Yoxall, 1063, 1064; Mr. Butcher, 1064–1066; Mr. Stuart, 1066.
Grants, Additional, Proposals as to.
*Os.* Mr. McKenna, *May 15*, 1053, 1054; Mr. Yoxall, 1063.
Local Control—Extension of Principle to all Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Silcock, *May 15*, 1037, 1038; Mr. Adkins, 1042, 1044; Sir P. Magnus, 1049, 1050; Mr. McKenna, 1054–1056; Sir W. Anson, 1056–1059; Mr. Butcher, 1065, 1066; Mr. Stuart, 1067.
Regulations, Date of Issuing.
*Q.* Sir F. Powell; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 15*, 962.
*Q.* Col. Harrison-Broadley; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 23*, 1164.
Teachers in Elementary Schools—Superannuation Rules, Presented, *May 29*, 1585, 1612.
Training Colleges, Sectarian Tests in—Abolition, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Silcock, *May 15*, 1037, 1038, 1039; Mr. Adkins, 1040; Mr. Shackleton, 1052; Mr. McKenna, 1055; Sir W. Anson, 1060; Mr. Yoxall, 1062; Mr. Butcher, 1064, 1065.
Discontinuance of Grant to Colleges enforcing, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Henry; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 8*, 224.

**Education (Ireland)**
[*For* particular places, *see their names.*]
Intermediate
Grants, Inadequacy of.
*Os.* Mr. J. Redmond, *May 13*, 124.
Programme for 1908, Working of and Date of Publication.
*Qs.* Mr. Flynn, Mr. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8* 231–235.
National School Teachers
Civil Rights—Decision as to Modification of Rules.
*Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 581.

[*cont.*

**Education (Ireland)**—*cont.*
National School Teachers—*cont.*
Salaries over £70, Reason for paying to certain Teachers.
*Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 203.
Primary, Application of Portion of Budget Surplus to, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 7*, 75, 76.

**Education (Scotland)**
*Vice-President of the Council*—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
[*For* particular places, *see their names.*]
Accountants' Report Presented, *May 23*, 1151; *May 28*, 1452.
Expediting Publication of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 13*, 642.
Continuation Classes—Code of Regulations Presented, *May 13*, 534, 569.
Report of Committee of Council Presented, *May 23*, 1153; *May 28*, 1452.
Reports, Date of Presenting.
*Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Shaw, *May 16*, 1102.
Technical Education, Funds applied to, by Local Authorities—Return Ordered, *May 29*, 1612.

**Education (Local Authority Default) Act, 1904**
Occasions for putting into Operation.
*Qs.* Mr. Clough; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *May 14*, 797.

**Education (Popular Control) Bill**
*c.* Intro., and 1R., *May 25*, 983, 984.

**Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill**
Second Reading, Date of taking.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 29*, 1647.

**Edwards, Mr. A. C.** [Denbigh District]
Free Labour Association, Allegations as to Contribution to by London and North Western Railway Company, *May 8*, 645.

**Egypt**
Assouan Dam
Nationality of Workmen employed.
*Qs.* Mr. J. Ward; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *May 13*, 625, 626.
Source of Payment of, Cost of raising and Firm entrusted with work.
*Qs.* Mr. Ashley, Mr. Bowles, Mr. J. Ward; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *May 7*, 61, 62.
British Consuls, Qualifications of.
*Qs.* Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. C. E. Price; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *May 14*, 789, 790.

**Egypt**—*cont.*
Cairo Post and Customs Offices, Observation of Moslem Day of Rest in.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 14*, 790.
Cotton Duty, Abolition or Reduction of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 7*, 63.
Departmental Reports, Practice as to communicating to Legislative Council.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 7*, 63, 64.
Frontier Delimitation—Progress of Negotiations with Turkey.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 7*, 64.
Government Service—Facilities for Examination of Natives.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 28*, 1469, 1470.
Ministry of Justice, British Judges and Officers attached to.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 14*, 788, 789.
Railway Administration, Improvement in, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 28*, 1469.
Time-tables, Method of Advertising.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 28*, 1470.
Sunday Closing of Shops, Regulations as to.
*Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 7*, 63.

**Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 16*, 1069.

**Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 16*, 1076.
2R.* *May 29*, 1609.

**Elgin and Kincardine, Earl of**—*Secretary of State for the Colonies.*
Transvaal, British Indians in
Correspondence relating to Legislation affecting, Tabling of, *May 29*, 1596.
Transvaal Registration Bill, Restrictions imposed by, Attitude of His Majesty's Government, towards, etc, *May 29*, 1591–1597

**Ellenborough, Lord**
Parliamentary Election, Disabilities of Seamen, Removal of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 13*, 542–544

**Ellis, Mr. J. E.** [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
Indian Budget, Proposals as to taking—Date of Issue of Explanatory Memorandum, etc., *May 7*, 59.

**Elphin**
United Irish League Meeting, Police Attendance at and Prosecutions in Connection with Disturbances.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 967.

**Embo**
Pier, Proposals for Improving.
*Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 28*, 1477.

**Emigration and Immigration**
Emigrants' Information Office, History and Functions of—Memorandum Presented, *May 23*, 1151; *May 28*, 1452.

**Empire Day**
War Office, Hoisting of Flag on, proposed.
*Qs.* Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 16*, 1092, 1093.

**Employment of Women Bill**
*l.* 2R., *May 14*, 365.
*Com., and Rep.* May 14*, 763.
3R.* *May 15*, 922.
*c.* 1R.* *May 24*, 1235.

**Enniskillen**
Postal Communication with Tempo, Improvement of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 13*, 587.

**Ennisnag**
Reinstatement Claim of R. Reddy.
*Q.* Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 7*, 73.

**Esmonde, Sir T. G.** [Wexford, N.]
Ancient Monuments
Arrangements for Preserving, *May 13* 583.
Number on Estates being Sold under Act of 1903, *May 27*, 1301.
Harbours Inspected with a View to Improvement, *May 13*, 583; *May 27*, 1300.
Land Purchase—Demesnes, Mansions, etc., coming into Estates Commissioners' hands since 1903, *May 9*, 345.
Wexford County Council Grant, Deductions from (1900–1907), *May 27*, 1303.

**Essex, Mr. R. W.** [Gloucestershire, Cirencester]
Zambesi—Victoria Falls, Conditions of Concessions made at, *May 14*, 784.

**Esslemont, Mr. G. B.** [Aberdeen, S.]
Poor Law, Scotland—Number of Persons in Receipt of Parochial Relief, *May 13*, 641.

**Estimates**
[*See titles* Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, *and* Navy Estimates.]

**Evans, Mr. S. T.** [Glamorganshire, Mid.]
Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 293.
Parliamentary Procedure—Period for Session, *May 15*, 982.
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 299.

**Everett, Mr. R. L.** [Suffolk, Woodbridge]
Income Tax—Permanency of, at 1s. in the £, *May 8*, 251, 252.
Swine Fever Regulations, inconvenience caused by, *May 23*, 1186.

**Evictions**
*See under* Ireland.

**Evidence (Colonial Statutes) Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 805.

**Exchequer Bonds**
Amount outstanding on 10th instant.
*Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 631, 632.
Information as to Number Current, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Ashton; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 9*, 344.

**Exchequer and Audit Department**
Hours of Labour of Officials.
*Qs.* Mr. Morton, Mr. Runciman, *May 16*, 1116.
Vote for, *May 16*, 1116.

**Exports and Imports**
Imports from Colonies and British Possessions in 1905 and 1906.
*Q.* Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 8*, 222.
*Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Lloyd George, *May 13*, 570
*Qs.* Mr. P. Pease, Mr. Arkwright, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 628, 629.
Duty paid in 1906.
*Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 13*, 763.
Military Stations Abroad, Record kept of Exports for use of.
*Q.* Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 8*, 222.

**Faber, Captain W. V.** [Hants, Andover]
Aliens
Crimes committed by, in London, during 1906, *May 8*, 219.
Criminals convicted during 1906, *May 14*, 790.

[*cont.*

**Faber, Capt. W. V.**—*cont.*
- Army
  - Brigadiers-General—Decision as to Honorary Rank on Retirement, *May 13*, 572.
  - Bulford Camp—Communication with Tidworth, *May 13*, 573.
  - Scots Greys—Number of Horses and Accommodation provided, *May 23*, 1153.
  - Special Contingent, Pay of, *May 16*, 1094.
- Building Trade, Employment Statistics for recent Years, *May 28*, 1466.
- Imperial Conference, Proceedings, Publicity of—Proposals for printing Discussion, *May 29*, 1636.
- Imports from the Colonies in 1905, *May 8*, 222.
- Marriages—Legislation to prevent Marriage of Persons with Hereditary Diseases, proposed, *May 8*, 242.
- Physique of the Nation—Statistics for last Ten Years, *May 29*, 1641.
- Stepney Parliamentary Area, Proportion of Foreign to British-born Voters in, *May 8*, 221.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1512.
- Volunteer Artillery, Proposals as to, under New Scheme, *May 14*, 783.

**Faber, Lord**
- Companies Bill, *Rep.*, *May 14*, 756.

**Faber, Mr. G. D.** [York]
- Income Tax
  - Collection, Assimilating English and Scotch Systems, Proposals as to, *May 8*, 253, 254.
  - Permanency of, at 1s. in the £, *May 8*, 252.

**Factory and Workshops Act**
- Homework—Order (23rd inst.), Presented *May 28*, 1454, 1461.
- Piece Work Wages—Orders (23rd inst.), Presented, *May 28*, 1455, 1461.

**Factory and Workshop Bill**
- *l.* 2R., *May 14*, 735.
- *Debate on Second Reading* [Lords], *May 14*, 735.
  - Act of 1901, History of, 736, 740.
  - Laundries
    - Bringing within the Scope of Act of 1901, proposed, 737.
    - Clause in Act of 1895 relating to, unsatisfactory working of, 737.
    - Floors, Inspection of, 738.

**Factory and Workshop Bill**—*cont.*
- *Debate on Second Reading* [Lords]—*cont.*
  - Laundries—*cont.*
    - Hours of Labour, Allocation of sixty-eight Hours per Week' 738, 745, 746.
    - Institutional Laundries, Provisions with regard to, 738, 739. 741, 747.
      - Exemption of Laundries at present under the Authority of any Government Department, proposed, 743, 744, 747, 748.
      - Inspection, Necessity for, 741, 743.
      - Reports of Inspectors as to, 742.
    - Stoves for heating, Regulations as to inspection of, 738.
    - Tenement Laundries, Provisions as to inspection of, 738.
  - Legislation by reference, Objections to, 746.

**Falmouth Gas Bill**
- *l.* 3R.* *May 8*, 198.

**Farrell, Mr. J. P.** [Longford, N.]
- Abbeylara—Reinstatement Claims of T. Reilly, P. Brady, and Alice Connor, *May 13*, 572.
- Army Pensions of T. Murphy and J. Tracy, *May 10*, 469, 470.
- Clogher—Farm of Mr. J. Martin, Sale Proposals for, *May 10*, 468.
- Conry Estate—Case of Mrs. Farrell, Interest Charged on Agreements, *May 10*, 469.
- Cusack Estate—Case of T. Keenan, *May 10*, 469.
- Liverpool—Case of T. Slevin, *May 13*, 570.

**Fell, Mr. A.** [Great Yarmouth]
- Aliens expelled, Provision for dealing with in case of return, *May 13*, 634.
- Butter sent from Denmark but originating in Siberia, Proposals for preventing Contravention of Act by, *May 27*, 1323.
- Congo Free State, Belgian Annexation—Effect on Lado Enclave, *May 28*, 1471.
- Income Tax
  - Permanency of, at 1s. in the Pound, *May 8*, 246, 247.
  - Reduction of to 11d. in the Pound, proposed, *May 8*, 246.
  - Repayments
    - Increase (1904–1906), Cause of, *May 13*, 631.
    - Section 133, Repayments under during 1904, 1905, and 1906 : *May 8*, 218.

[*cont.*

**Fell, Mr. A.**—*cont.*
- Irish Council Bill, Annual Grant, Provision for, *May 13*, 581.
- Mail Service between San-Francisco and New Zealand, Resumption of Three-Weekly Service, proposed, *May 9*, 422.
- Merchant Shipping
  - British and German Vessels, Passengers carried to United States by (1904–6); *May 27*, 1322.
  - Classification of certain Lines, *May 27*, 1321, 1323.
- Militia Artillery, Garrison—Saving effected on Ammunition used for Training, *May 7*, 58.
- Salonica—Negotiations for Re-payment of Ransom in Abbott Case, *May 27*, 1317.
- Smyrna, Brigandage near—Effect of Abbott Case, *May 27*, 1317.
- Trade, Board of—Labour Department, Functions of, as to assisting Workmen to find Work, *May 7*, 68.

**Fenwick, Mr. C.** [Northumberland, Wansbeck]
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Proposals as to, *May 28*, 1473.

**Ferens, Mr. T. R.** [Hull, E.]
- Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 701–707.

**Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M.** [Leith Burghs]
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Expenditure by Authorities set up by the Bill, Provisions as to, *May 24*, 1236–1242.
- Telegraph Service in Scotland—Underground Wires, Progress made with laying, *May 9*, 397.

**Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G.** [Fermanagh, N.]
- Achill and Mulrany Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 13*, 587.
- Dublin Valuation, Progress made with, *May 27*, 1332.
- Enniskillen, Postal Communication with Tempo, Improvement of proposed, *May 13*, 587.
- Forestry Department, Creation of, for Ireland, proposed, *May 13*, 597.
- Irish Council Bill
  - Eight Departments, Local Habitation of, *May 16*, 1087.
  - Privy Council Judicial Committee, Powers to be conferred on, *May 16*, 1087.
- Land Commission—Church Temporalities Fund, Allocation of Surplus Income, *May 13*, 578; *May 27*, 1302.
- Law Courts, Ireland—Proposals for Maintenance of Supreme Courts under New Scheme, *May 27*, 1302.

**Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G.**—*cont.*
- Militia—Caps and Putties of New Pattern, Cause for Delay in Issue of, *May 13*, 606.
- Piers and Harbours—Grants since 1840, *May 14*, 780.
- Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill, Facilities for Passage of, proposed, *May 13*, 600.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour
  - Repatriations effected down to 1st inst, *May 16*, 1080.
  - Unlicensed Coolies, Cost of Repatriating, *May 16*, 1080.
- Tullamore Whisky Frauds—Decision as to Prosecution, etc., *May, 13*, 643.

**Field, Mr. W.** [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Birr Postmastership, Applications received for, *May 7*, 51.
- Civil Service, Promotions from the Ranks opposed by the Treasury during the last Five Years, *May, 15*, 940.
- Financial Relations with Great Britain—Revenue and Expenditure during last Twenty Years, *May 15*, 935, 940.
- Gambling in Options and Futures, American Legislation against, Issuing of Return proposed, *May 8*, 205.
- Income tax—Co-operative Trading Societies, Assessment of, proposed, *May 8*, 206.
- Irish Estimates, Surpluses on Votes surrendered since 1903, etc., *May 15*, 941.
- Ordnance Survey, Conveyance of Employees, Arrangements for, *May 7*, 54.
- Post Office
  - Irish Business—Revenue and Expenditure (1890–1906), *May 14*, 773.
  - Postal Orders—Irish Business, Transfer to Ireland, proposed, *May 14*, 773.
  - Surveying Department, Promotion System in, *May 15*, 940.
- Post Office Savings Bank
  - Irish Business
    - Transfer to Ireland, proposed, *May 14*, 774.
    - Withdrawals during 1906, *May 14*, 772.
  - Quit Rents, Accumulated Funds derived from and Expenditure of, *May 15*, 935.

**Finance Bill**
- c. 1r.* *May 8*, 277.
- 2r., *May 13*, 651; *May 14*, 805.

**Fintown**
- Boyle, M'Monagle and Moy, Charges against—Procedure in Trial etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. H. Law; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 13*, 571.

*May* 7—*May* 29.

**First Commissioner of Works**
*Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt.*

**First Lord of the Admiralty**
*Lord Tweedmouth.*

**First Lord of the Treasury**
*Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*

**Fiscal Policy**
Adaptation of to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for.
*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 651, 654–658, 664; Mr. Lyttelton, 691–695; Mr. Lambton, 696–699; Sir E. Sassoon, 718–720; Mr. Buxton, 722–728; Mr. J. Collings, 728–732; Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 14*, 836–847; Mr. Mond, 859–865; Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 865–869; Mr. Rendall, 869–871; Mr. Hunt, 871–876; Mr. Harwood, 889–893; Mr. B. Law, 893–905; Mr. Runciman, 907–912

Colonial Preference, Question of Advantages offered by the Colonies.
*Os.* Mr. C. Money, *May 14*, 805–812; Mr. Mallet, 830 – 834, 438; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 834–836, 838, 845–847; Mr. Asquith, 850, 853–856; Mr. Toulmin, 881–886; Mr. Harwood, 891, 892; Mr. B. Law, 902–906.

Industries of the Country, Effect of Free Trade System on.
*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 664; Mr. E. Cecil, 673, 674; Mr. Hunt, *May 14*, 872–876; Mr. Toulmin, 877–879; Mr. P. Pease, 887; Mr. Runciman, 906, 911.

Manufactured Goods, 10 per cent. Tax on.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 13*, 723, 726, 727; Mr. C. Money, *May 14*, 812, 813; Mr. Runciman, 909.

Protection, Advantages of System.
*Os.* Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 14*, 836–841; Mr. Asquith, 847; Mr. B. Law, 893.

**Fisheries**
Ireland—Report (1905) Presented, *May 28*, 1453, 1462.
Scotland
Report of Board
Date of Presenting.
*Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Shaw, *May 16*, 1103.
Presented, *May 15*, 922, 927.
Trawling
Illegal—Increase of Penalties proposed, *Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 27*, 1331.
Moray Firth, *see that title.*

**Fitzgate, Captain, Estate of**
Reinstatement Claims of P. Callan and J. Wiseman.
*Q.* Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 339, 340.

**Fitzmaurice, Lord**—*Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs*
Macedonia, Date of tabling Papers relating to, *May 29*, 1608.
Sugar Beet
Brussels Convention, Adherence to essential for Success of Sugar Beet Industry, Alleged, *May 13*, 559, 560.
Cultivation in British Isles—Establishment of Manufactories, Question of remitting Excise Duty, etc., *May 13*, 559.

**Fitzwilliam Estate**
Case of T. Whelan of Aghowle.
*Q.* Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 237.

**Flavin, Mr. M. J.** [Kerry, N.]
Browne Estate, Reinstatement Claims of J. Faley and W. Hennesay, *May 13*, 600.
Cloontubbrid — Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. O'Connor, *May 14*, 780.
Inch East—Reinstatement Claim of B. Galvin, *May 14*, 779.
Land Purchase Advance, Means of ascertaining Security for, in Certain Cases, *May 8*, 226.
Lincolnshire, Crime in—Condition of Brigg Division, *May 8*, 220.
Mevoo—Grazing Land, Purchase Proposals for, *May 13*, 599.
Ormathwaite Estate, Reinstatement Claim of T. Walsh, *May 14*, 771.
Shronowen—Reinstatement Claim of M. Mulirhill, *May 14*, 780.

**Flynn, Mr. J. C.** [Cork, N.]
Agriculture Department, Meeting, Date of Holding, *May 8*, 235.
Annagh Bogs, Ownership of, *May 8*, 229.
Blackwater Salmon Fisheries—Extension of Close-time proposed, *May 29*, 1614.
Education, Intermediate, Programme for 1908, Working of and Date of Publication, *May 8*, 231–235.
Knocknacolon, Sale Proposals for, *May 9*, 346.
Newman Estate—Reinstatement Claim of T. O'Callagham, *May 15*, 938.

**Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill**
*c. Con.* May 13*, 566.
3R.* *May 16*, 1075.
*l.* Commons' Amendts. *Con.* May 28*, 1450.

**Food and Drink**
Present System, Taxation on Food under.
*Os.* Mr. P. Pease, *May 14*, 886, 887.
Taxes on, during 1906–7.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 28*, 1472.

**Foreign Office**
*Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
*Under-Secretary*—Lord Fitzmaurice.

**Forster, Mr. H. W.** [Kent, Sevenoaks]
Supply, Proceedings in Committee having been terminated by a Count-out, Procedure as to setting up Committee afresh, etc., *May 23*, 1166, 1167.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 29*, 1711.
Trade and Commerce—Classification of Machinery in Annual Statements, *May 23*, 1163.
United States—Concessions granted to Germany, *May 23*, 1164.

**Foster, Sir B. W.** [Derby, Ilkeston]
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1396–1399.

**Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H.**—*Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster* [Wolverhampton, E.]
Pontefract, Secondary School Site, Conditions of Offer of, *May 9*, 367.

**France**
Trade Reports Presented, *May 13*, 534; *May 14*, 734; *May 28*, 1450.

**Free Labour Association**
Contribution to by London and North Western Railway Company, Allegations as to.
*Os.* Colonel Lockwood, *May 13*, 644; Mr. C. Edwards, 645.

**Friendly Societies**
Land Tax, Rule as to Exemption from.
*Q.* Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 9*, 356.

**Fruit Growers (Scotland) Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 7*, 77.

**Fruit Growing**
Recommendations of Committee of 1905, Proposals as to carrying out.
*Os.* Mr. Beck, *May 23*, 1189; Sir E. Strachey, 1201, 1202.

**Galway**
County Surveyorship for East Galway, Procedure in applying for.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 598.
Poor Rate Collectors—New Arrangements as to Irrecoverable Arrears.
*Q.* Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 373.

**Gambling in Options and Futures**
American Legislation against—Issuing as Return, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 8*, 205.

**Gardner, Mr. E.** [Berkshire, Wokingham]
Cattle Importation Regulations, Effect of, *May 23*, 1187.
Dairying Industry, Necessity for Regulation of, *May 23*, 1187, 1188.

**Garrison**
Telegraph Extension to, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 13*, 588, 589.

**Gas Undertakings**
Returns (1906) Ordered, *May 9*, 336.

**General Accident Fire and Life Assurance Corporation Limited, Bill**
*l.* *Rep.** *May 14*, 733.
3R.* *May 28*, 1449.
*c.* 1R.* *May 29*, 1610.

**Germany**
Colonial Legislative Proposals as to British Indians—British Government Representations, proposed.
*Os.* Lord Ampthill, *May 29*, 1895, 1590.
*Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1631.
Naval Recruits, Age and Training of.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 9*, 343, 344.
Trade with, in 1904 and 1905.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 24*, 1234.
Report Presented, *May 28*, 1451.

**Ginnell, Mr. L.** [Westmeath, N.]
Burrowes Estate, Sale Proposals for, *May 8*, 226.
County and Borough Council Grants, Deductions from—Proposals for Obviating, etc., *May 13*, 586.
Devolution Scheme of Lord Dunraven, Circulation of Copy of, proposed, *May 14*, 779.
Evictions, Legislative Proposals for Dealing with and Date of Presenting Special Report, *May 13*, 594.
Irish Council Bill
Departments not under Control of, Information as to—Expenditure on Land Purchase, etc., *May 14*, 779; *May 27*, 1304.
Eight Departments proposed to be Dealt with, Annual Income of, etc., *May 14*, 779; *May 27*, 1304.
Land Judges Court, Sale of Estates, Procedure Taken for, *May 8*, 226.

[*cont.*

**Ginnell, Mr. L.**—*cont.*

Land Purchase

Arrears, Proceedings taken for Recovery of (1903–1907), *May 8*, 227.

Finance—Opportunity for Discussion, *May 14*, 771.

Tenant Right, Procedure in Valuing, *May 8*, 228.

Treasury Rules under Act of 1903—Discussion of Amendments, proposed, *May 8*, 241.

Zone System, Facilities for Fraud given by and Proposals for Prevention of Inclusion of Extraneous Debts in Prices, *May 8*, 240.

Privy Council, Irish—Names, etc., of Members, *May 14*, 778.

Roads, Maintenance of, when Altered by Construction of Railways, *May 29*, 1613.

Westmeath—Untenanted Land in Delvin and Mullingar Districts, *May 13*, 594

**Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.**—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]

Aliens

Crimes Committed by, in London during 1906, *May 8*, 219.

Criminals Convicted during 1906, *May 14*, 790.

Expelled Aliens, Provision for Dealing with in Case of Return, *May 13*, 634.

Naturalisation in the Colonies, Effect of, on Status of Persons in United Kingdom, *May 8*, 219.

Cabs

Privilege Cab System, Progress of Negotiations as to, *May 9*, 357.

Taximeter Cabs, Sealing of Taximeters, Cause for Delay in, *May 24*, 1232.

Cartridges Seized at Newcastle—Sentence on J. Hogarth, *May 16*, 1085.

Clitheroe Women Weavers and the Dinner-Hour—Alleged Statement by Inspector, *May 15*, 960.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill

Committee, Constitution of Evidence taken by and Date of Issuing Report, *May 13*, 574.

Proposals as to, *May 28*, 1473, 1474.

Coal Mines, Inquiry as to Hours of Labour—Date of Issuing Report, *May 14*, 790.

Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill, Inquiry—Inclusion of Scottish Representative, proposed, *May 8*, 221.

Court of Criminal Appeal, Cases likely to be Submitted to and Probable Cost of, *May 13*, 590.

**Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.**—*cont.*

Criminal Procedure—Petitions on behalf of Convicted Persons received in Home Office during 1905, *May 13*, 590.

Cumberland, Police Promotion System, Legality of, *May 8*, 220.

Edalji Case

Compensation, Decision as to, *May 28*, 1473.

Report of Committee, Proposals for Tabling, *May 13*, 635.

First Offenders, Necessity for Differentiating Prison Treatment of, *May 23*, 1221, 1222.

Juvenile Offenders, Reformatory System, Extension of, *May 23*, 1222.

Laundries—Legislative Proposals for Inspecting, *May 15*, 959.

Leigh—Dog Licence Cases of T. Leigh, and J. W. Lee, Decision given in, *May 28*, 1465.

Lincolnshire, Crime in—Condition of Brigg Division, *May 8*, 220.

Liquor Traffic

Children taken into Public-houses, Result of Inquiry as to, *May 28*, 1474.

Licensed Premises—Statistics for 1st January, *May 27*, 1320.

Liverpool—Case of T. Slevin, *May 13*, 571.

London, Accidents caused by Motors and by Horse-drawn Vehicles during last Six Months, *May 27*, 1318.

Lottery Circulars, Postal Transmission of, *May 29*, 1641.

Motors, Accidents during last Six Months, *May 27*, 1318, 1319.

Paddington Borough Council, Refusal to take Proceedings against certain Traders, Explanation of, *May 9*, 357.

Physique of the Nation—Statistics for last Ten Years, *May 29*, 1641.

Police, Metropolitan—Increase and Weekly Day of Rest, Proposals as to, *May 29*, 1640, 1641.

Post Office—Sanitary Condition of London Offices, Inquiry into Proposals for Presenting Report, *May 15*, 932.

Prisons

Dietary, Alleged Inadequacy of, *May 23*, 1218.

Executive Boards, Appointment of Women on, proposed, *May 23*, 1220.

Governors, Policy of Appointing Naval and Military Officers, *May 23*, 1220.

Warders, Class of Men employed, *May 23*, 1220.

Women Inspectors, Appointment of, proposed, *May 23*, 1221.

[*cont.*

**Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.**—*cont.*

Public Demonstrations, Cost of, Inconvenience caused by and Police employed in Regulating, *May 15*, 958, 959.

Redhill—Decision in Case of F. T. Hemsley, *May 8*, 221.

Russian Social Democrat Conference—Allegations as to Police Espionage, etc., *May 27*, 1319, 1320.

Shoreditch, Condition of, and Proposals for Dealing with, *May 15*, 959.

Stepney, Parliamentary Area, Proportion of Foreign to British-born Voters in, *May 8*, 221.

Street Betting Act—Amendment to deal with Facilities afforded for Betting in Factories, proposed, *May 27*, 1321.

Street Betting Act, Effect of—Introduction of amending Legislation, proposed, *May 13*, 634.

Vagrancy, Recommendations of Committee, Date of giving Effect to, *May 23*, 1222.

Vivisection Licences, Procedure in Granting, *May 15*, 960.

Workmen's Compensation Act — Casual Workmen, Definition of, Issue of Circular proposed, *May 28*, 1466.

Youthful Offenders Act, Working of Inquiry into, proposed, *May 13*, 633.

Zoological Gardens, Feeding of Pythons on Live Animals, Allegations as to, *May 9*, 358.

**Glasgow**

Foreign Animals Wharf Order, Presented, *May 28*, 1454, 1462.

Telephone Operators, Conditions of Transfer of.
*Q.* Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 8*, 224.

**Glendinning, Mr. R.** [Antrim, N.]

Ballymoney—Inquiry into Carnfinton Cottages Scheme, proposed, *May 15*, 975.

**Glennamaddy**

Grant for Relief of Distress in, Decision as to.
*Q.* Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 595.

**Glover, Mr. T.** [St. Helen's]

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Proposals as to, *May 28*, 1473.

**Goddard, Mr. D. F.** [Ipswich]

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1690.

**Gooch, Mr. G. P.** [Bath]

Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 154–158.

**Gort**

Rural District Valuations—Power of Galway County Council to refuse to give List of Ratepayers asking for Revision.
*Q.* Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1107.

**Goschen, Viscount**

Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *May 15*, 921.

**Government Departments**

(*See also names of Departments as* Post Office, etc.)

Committee to consider all Questions relating to Conditions of Employment, Appointment of, proposed.
*Os.* Lord Balcarres, *May 16*, 1141.

Securities held by—Return Presented, *May 16*, 1078.

**Government Property**

Rates on

Apartments provided in Royal Palaces, Reason for defraying Rates out of Public Funds.
*Os.* Mr. Morton, *May 16*, 1113, 1114; Mr. Runciman, 1113.

Assessment, Method adopted for.
*Os.* Mr. Morton, *May 16*, 1113; Mr. Bellairs, 1114; Mr. J. D. White, 1114; Mr. Rees, 1114; Mr. Runciman, 1115.

Houses occupied by Foreign Representatives, Amount paid on.
*Os.* Mr. Morton, *May 16*, 1113, 1116; Mr. Runciman, 1115; Mr. L. Jones, 1115; Sir F. Banbury, Mr. Crooks, 1116.

Vote for, *May 16*, 1112.

**Grace, Lady, Estate of**

Sale Proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 579.

**Granard, Earl of**

Companies Bill, *Rep.*, *May 14*, 749, 750, 751, 753, 756, 757, 758.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *May 28*, 1458.

Parliamentary Elections, Seamen's Disabilities, Removal of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 13*, 541.

**Grangemouth**

Telephone Service at, Reason for Removal of Trunk Exchange to Falkirk, etc.
*Os.* Mr. Smeaton, *May 9*, 396; Mr. Buxton, 415.

**Grant, Mr. C.** [Warwickshire, Rugby]

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.* *May 13*, 709.

**Gravesend**
Water-guard Inspector, Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer.
*Os.* Sir G. Parker, *May 16*, 1120–1122, 1123, 1125; Mr. Runciman, 1122, 1123, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1128; Mr. C. Hay, 1123; Mr. Watt, 1123; Mr. W. Rutherford, 1124, 1125, 1128, 1129, 1130; Mr. Morton, 1125, 1130–1132; Mr. Maddison, 1127, 1128; Sir F. Banbury, 1128; Mr. L. Jones, 1130.

**Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 8*, 197.

**Great Central Railway Bill**
*c. Con.* *May 14*, 764.
3R.* *May 29*, 1609.

**Great Northern and City Railway Bill**
*c.* 3R.* *May 9*, 333.
*l.* 1R.* *May 13*, 533.

**Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill**
*c.* 3R.* *May 7*, 47.
*l.* 1R.* *May 8*, 197.
2R.* *May 16*, 1069.

**Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill**
*l.* 3R.* *May 8*, 198.
*c.* 1R.* *May 13*, 568.
2R.* *May 28*, 1460.

**Greece**
Trade Reports Presented, *May 15*, 922.

**Greenwich Hospital**
Pensions—Order in Council sanctioning further Re-arrangement, Presented, *May 28*, 1454, 1463.

**Greenwich Observatory**
London County Council Generating Station—Progress of Negotiations.
*Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 14*, 781.

**Greenwood, Mr. G.** [Peterborough]
Land Registration System, Revision of, proposed, *May 27*, 1325.
Marines, Royal—Officers, Details of New Scheme for, *May 7*, 56.
Zoological Gardens, Feeding of Pythons on live Animals, Allegations as to, *May 9*, 358.

**Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.**—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
Baghdad Railway, Position of Great Britain with regard to, *May 15*, 1011.

**Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.**—*cont.*
Congo Free State, Belgian Administration
Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives—Responsibility of Great Britain, etc., *May 15*, 1011–1016.
Effect on Lado Enclave, *May 28*, 1471.
Cuba—Messrs. Fowler & Co.'s Claim against the Spanish Government, *May 27*, 1296.
Egypt
Assouan Dam, Raising of—Source of Payment of Cost, and Firm entrusted with Work, *May 7*, 61, 62.
British Consuls, Qualifications of, *May 14*, 789, 790.
Cairo Post and Customs Offices, Observation of Moslem Day of Rest in, *May 14*, 790.
Cotton Duty, Abolition or Reduction of, proposed, *May 7*, 63.
Departmental Reports, Practice as to communicating to Legislative Council, *May 7*, 64.
Frontier Delimitaton—Progress of Negotiations with Turkey, *May 7*, 64.
Government Service—Facilities for Examination of Natives, *May 28*, 1470.
Ministry of Justice, British Judges and Officers attached to, *May 14*, 789.
Railways
Administration, Improvement in, proposed, *May 28*, 1469.
Time-tables, Method of Advertising, *May 28*, 1470.
Sunday Closing of Shops, Regulations as to, *May 7*, 63.
Hague Conference, Proposals for Discussion and Date of Meeting, *May 28*, 1471.
Korea—Allegations as to Subsidy on Japanese Cotton Goods, *May 16*, 1098.
Morocco, Disturbances, Information as to, *May 9*, 356.
Russo-Japanese War—Compensation Claims for British Vessels seized by Russian Cruisers, *May 23*, 1165.
Soudan—Bahr-el-Ghazal—Date of evacuation by Congolese Troops, *May 28*, 1471.
Sweden and Norway, Treaty in substitution for that of 1885, progress of Negotiations for, *May 14*, 788.
Tokio—Qualifications of Medical Officers to British Embassy, *May 14*, 787.
Tonkin Railways—Arrangements for Conveyance of British and French Goods *May 14*, 788.
United States, Concessions Granted to Germany, *May 23*, 1164.

**Guest, Mr. J. C.** [Cardiff District]
  Territorial and Reserve Forces' Bill, *Com., May 28*, 1545–1547, 1565, 1566.

**Haddock, Mr. G. B.** [Lancs, N. Lonsdale]
  Jamaica—Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham
    Censure by Lord Elgin, Offer made to withdraw, *May 8*, 214.
    Telegrams as to Action, Procedure taken in sending to United States by War Office, *May 8*, 214.
  Unemployed, Expenditure on Relief, *May 28*, 1475.

**Hague Conference**
  British Delegates' Powers as to signing of Conventions, etc.
    *Q.* Mr. Rees ; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1639.
  Mining Operations in Territorial Waters, Discussion of, proposed.
    *Q.* Mr. Nield ; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 13*, 601.
  Proposals for Discussion and Date of Meeting.
    *Q.* Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 28*, 1470, 1471.

**Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.**—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
  Africa, South, Garrison—Stores and Supplies sent in 1906, Value and Description, *May 8*, 208.
  Artillery, Fortieth Brigade Royal Field—Compensation for Expenditure incurred through cancelled Orders, *May 16*, 1091.
  Barracks, Accommodation for Royal Army Temperance Association, Number without, *May 16*, 1090.
  Billeting of Soldiers, Authority responsible for arrangements as to, *May 8*, 208.
  Bulford Camp—Communication with Tidworth, *May 13*, 573.
  Cavalry Barracks in Scotland, Decision as to, *May 16*, 1091 ; *May 23*, 1160.
  Engineer Civil Staff—Position of—Proposals for Improvement, etc., *May 15*, 948.
  Horses, Provision of in Time of War, *May 7*, 57.
  Kilcreggan—Particulars of War Office Purchase of Land, *May 29*, 1627.
  Lyddite Shell manufactured at Ordnance Factories, Cause for and percentage of rejections, *May 13*, 608, 609.
  Military Compulsory Training in Secondary Schools, Proposals as to Grant for, *May 9*, 352.

**Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.**—*cont.*
  Militia
    Artillery
      Garrison—Saving effected on Ammunition used for Training, *May 7*, 58.
      Mounted Training for Officers and Rank and File, Facilities for, *May 13*, 610, 611.
    Caps and Putties of New Pattern, Cause for Delay in issue of, *May 13*, 606.
    Reorganisation Proposals, Postponement of, proposed, *May 13*, 610.
    Special Contingent, Inducements to join, *May 16*, 1089.
  Nealon, Michael, Inquiry into Case of, proposed, *May 15*, 947.
  Officers
    Brigadiers—General Decision as to Honorary Rank on Retirement, *May 13*, 572.
    Supernumerary Majors of disbanded Infantry Battalions, Appointments offered to, *May 23*, 1159.
  Ordnance Survey, Conveyance of Employees, Arrangements for, *May 7*, 54.
  Pensions
    Craig, Hugh and S. Lisle, Cases of, *May 9*, 349 ; *May 24*, 1235.
    Extension to Aged Poor Soldiers not in Possession of Medal, proposed, *May 29*, 1628
    Murphy, T. and J. Tracy, Cases of, *May 10*, 470.
  Piershill Barracks—Date of Occupation by Artillery, *May 23*, 1160.
  Recruiting and Enlistment, Minimum Age for Enlistment, *May 27*, 1308.
  Reservists, Special, Pay, etc., of, *May 15*, 948.
  Rifle Clubs—Issue of Army Rifles unsuitable for Conversion, proposed, *May 13*, 606.
  Rifles—Date of Completion of Conversion of Number mentioned in Estimates, *May 8*, 209.
  Scots Greys
    Decision as to Place of Quartering, *May 14*, 783 ; *May 23*, 1154.
    Horses, Number of, and Accommodation provided, *May 23*, 1153.
  Territorial Force
    Accounts of County Associations, Audit of, *May 9*, 352.
    Armament of Artillery, *May 27*, 1307.
    Conditions of Service—Proposals for securing Uniformity, *May 13*, 609.
    Cost of, *May 28*, 1468.

**Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.**—*cont.*
- Territorial Force—*cont.*
  - Deputy Lieutenants—Measures for securing competency to organise, *May 23*, 1159.
  - Enlistment, Regulations governing, *May 13*, 607.
  - Lance-Corporals, Decision as to, *May 13*, 605; *May 27*, 1306.
  - Officers' Privileges as to competing for Commissions in the Regular Army, *May 29*, 1628, 1629.
  - Soldiers' Kits, Issue and maintenance of, *May 13*, 605; *May 27*, 1307.
  - Walking-out Uniform, Provision of, *May 13*, 605; *May 27*, 1307.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1483, 1486, 1488, 1501–1507, 1535, 1542–1544, 1565, 1566, 1567, 1568; *May 29*, 1725, 1728, 1729, 1730.
  - Auxiliary Forces, Permanent Staff, Proposals as to, *May 7*, 55.
  - Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1662, 1867, 1678–1684, 1689, 1690, 1697.
  - Financial Provisions of, *May 16*, 1089.
    - Referring Paper 3370 to Public Accounts Committee, Proposals for, *May 29*, 1629.
- Transvaal
  - Miners' Strike—Authority for use of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 27*, 1309–1312.
  - Volunteer Force, Proposals for raising, *May 13*, 608.
- Volunteers
  - Artillery, Proposals as to under New Scheme, *May 14*, 783.
  - Crossan, Gunner, Decision in Case of, *May 13*, 610.
  - Equipment, Cause for delay in considering, *May 27*, 1308.
  - Retired—Conditions of joining Territorial Force, *May 16*, 1090.
  - Special Contingent, Inducements to join, *May 16*, 1090.
- Woolwich Arsenal
  - Admiralty Contracts allotted to, *May 13*, 611.
  - Discharged Workmen
    - Emigration, Authority for giving advice as to, *May 13*, 607.
    - Reconsideration of Decision proposed, *May 7*, 57, 58.
  - Gun-mountings, Allocation of Contracts for, *May 13*, 611.
  - Inquiry, Scope of, *May 13*, 583.
  - Labourers' Wage, Minimum of, *May 16*, 1091; *May 29*, 1627.
  - Minimum Staff, Decision as to, *May 15*, 947.
- Yeomanry, Armament—Decision as to Bayonet, *May 27*, 1308.

**Halifax**
- Copley School, Accommodation in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Carlile; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 16*, 1085, 1086.
- Salterhebble Church of England School, Reason for discontinuance of Grant to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. Carlile, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *May 29*, 1643–1645.

**Halpin, Mr. J.** [Clare, W.]
- Inchiquin, Lord, Estate of—Rent Recovery Proceedings, Allegations as to Threat of, *May 8*, 230.

**Halsall Charity**
- Scheme, Cause for Delay in preparing.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Kekewich; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 14*, 796.

**Halsbury, Earl of**
- Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill, 2R, *May 8*, 199.
- Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, Second Reading, Date of taking, *May 15*, 925.

**Hammersmith**
- Workhouse and Infirmary at Wormwood Scrubbs, Cost of and Accommodation provided in.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Burns, *May 13*, 639, 640.

**Harcourt, Right Hon. L.**—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]
- British Museum Reading Room, Redecoration of, Contract Stipulations as to Subletting of Piece-work, *May 13*, 640.
- Mall to Charing Cross Improvement—Electric Light Standards for the Mall, Date of erecting, *May 7*, 70.
- Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro, *May 27*, 1377–1388, 1423, 1424.
- Works Office Vote, Cause for Increase in, *May, 15*, 963.

**Hardy, Mr. G. A.** [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
- Lottery Circulars, Postal Transmission of, *May 29*, 1641.

**Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S.** [Liverpool, Everton]
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Circumstances of Attendance of Sir J. Mackay—Authority for Statements on Preference etc, *May 8*, 210.
- Income Tax
  - Earned Incomes not Exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £., *May 8*, 249.
    - Shares in Limited Companies taken as Part Earnings, Position of, *May 8*, 250.
  - State Banking Corporation Limited, Prosecution of Directors, Proposals as to. *May 7*, 53.

[*cont.*

**Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S.**—*cont.*
- Taxation, Local
  - Account, Proposals as to alteration in, *May 7*, 66.
  - Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Exchequer, Proposed Abolition of System, *May 8*, 275–277.

**Harris, Mr. Leverton** [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
- Artillery—Fortieth Brigade Royal Field, Compensation to, for Expenditure incurred through cancelled Orders. *May 16*, 1090.

**Harrison-Broadley, Col. H. B.** [Yorks, E.R., Howdenshire]
- Army
  - Cavalry Allocation to Scotland, *May 23*, 1159.
  - Piershill Barracks—Date of Occupation by Artillery, *May 23*, 1160.
- Imperial Conference Proceedings—Date of issuing Report, *May 23*, 1162.
- Muslins Exported to Germany and Re-imported after Finishing—Extent of Trade, *May 23*, 1163.
- Secondary School Regulations, Date of Issuing. *May 23*, 1164.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour—Conditions of Obtaining, *May 23*, 1162.

**Harrison's Patent Bill**
- *l. Rep.* May 14*, 733.
  - 3R.* *May 28*, 1449.
- *c.* 1R.* *May 29*, 1610.

**Hart-Davies, Mr. T.** [Hackney, N.]
- Army—Sandhurst Cadets, Cause for Delay in Gazetting, *May 16*, 1094.
- Customs and Excise—Outdoor Staff, Conditions of Service of, *May 16*, 1135.
- Indian Police—Decision as to Period for Retirement, *May 13*, 593.
- Naval Assistant Engineers, Entering for Temporary Service, Circular Supplied to, *May 28*, 1463.
- Poor Law Children Boarded-Out in the Country, Payment of Cost of Educating, *May 14*, 795.

**Hartley Wintney**
- School Accommodation—Decision as to Enlargement.
  - *Q.* Sir A. Spicer; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 24*, 1233.

**Harwood, Mr. G.** [Bolton]
- Coal, Export Tax on, Advantages of, *May 14*, 888, 889.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 888–893.

**Harwood, Mr. G.**—*cont.*
- Fiscal Policy
  - Adaptation of, to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 14*, 889–893.
  - Colonial Preference, Question of—Advantages Offered by the Colonies, *May 14*, 891, 892.
- Old-Age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 14*, 889.

**Haslam, Mr. L.** [Monmouth Boroughs]
- Workmen's Compensation Act—Casual Workmen, Definition of—Issue of Circular, proposed, *May 28*, 1466.

**Hawaii**
- Trade Report Presented, *May 15*, 922.

**Hay, Mr. C. G. D.** [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
- Consular Service, Reason for Increase in Estimate for, *Moy 15*, 956.
- Customs and Excise
  - Abstractor Clerks, Claims of, *May 16*, 1142.
  - Vote for—Increase Due to Increments of Salaries, *May 15*, 941.
- Gravesend Water-Guard Inspector, Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16*, 1123.
- Income Tax
  - Poor Rates for Purposes of, Reason for Increase in Cost of Publishing and Providing Copies, *May 16*, 1142.
  - Statutory Declarations, Objections to Method of Issuing Demand Notes, etc., *May 16*, 1143–1146.
- Inland Revenue Department Supervising Officers—Memorial for Inquiry into Conditions of Service and Pay, *May 16*, 1451, 1147.
- Mall to Charing Cross Improvement—Electric Light Standards for the Mall, Date of Erecting, *May 7*, 70.
- Mail Service—Scheme for All British Route, *May 29*, 1656.
- Mint—Gold Coinage, Reason for Increased Loss on, *May 16*, 1117.
- Shoreditch, Condition of and Proposals for Dealing with, *May 15*, 959.
- Superannuation—Decision as to Reckoning Military Service of Civil Servants, *May 15*, 957.
- Valuation Bill—Introduction, Proposals as to, *May 7*, 369.
- Works Office Vote, Cause for Increase in, *May 15*, 963.

**Hayden, Mr. J. P.** [Roscommon, S.]
- Customs Department, Promotion System in, *May 9*, 341.

**Hazel, Dr. A. E. W.** [West Bromwich]
- Weights and Measures Act—Final Regulations, Date of issue of and Cause for Delay, *May 7*, 67.

**Hazleton, Mr. R.** [Galway, N.]
Glennamaddy, Grant for Relief of Distress in, Decision as to, *May 13*, 595.
O'Rorke Estate, Sale proposals for, *May 13*, 595.

**Heaton, Mr. J. H.** [Canterbury]
Government Printing Office, Establishment of, proposed, *May 9*, 390.
Post Office
Financial Position of, *May 9*, 386.
Permanent Officials, Criticisms on Policy of, *May 9*, 414.
Postage
Foreign Postal Rates, Anomalies of, *May 9*, 390.
Newspaper Rates to Canada, Reduction in, *May 9*, 389.
Penny Post with United States, Establishment of, proposed, *May 9*, 390.
Public Service Board to Deal with all Questions Relating to, Establishment of, proposed, *May 9*, 389, 390.
Spain, Registered Letters not Delivered in —Result of Inquiry, *May 14*, 775.
Telegraph Service, Communication with the Colonies and Foreign Countries, Necessity for Remedying Anomalies of Present System, *May 9*, 390, 391.

**Helmsley, Lord** [Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk]
Woolwich Arsenal Minimum Staff, Decision as to, *May 15*, 947.

**Henry, Mr. C. S.** [Shropshire, Wellington]
Training Colleges, Religious Tests on Admission of Students, Discontinuance of Grant to Colleges Enforcing, proposed, *May 8*, 224.

**Herbert, Colonel** [Monmouthshire, S.]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1487.

**Herbert, Mr. T. A.** [Buckinghamshire, Wycombe]
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Unlicensed Coolies, Position of and Measures Taken to Deal with, *May 13*, 624.

**Hereford**
Scudamore Charity, Administration of—proposals as to Inquiry.
*Q.* Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Trevelyan, *May 9*, 367.

**Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill**
*l. Rep.* May 14*, 733.
3R.* *May 28*, 1449.
*c.* 1R.* *May 29*, 1610.

**Higham, Mr. J. S.** [Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby]
Africa, South—Government Stores, Imported (1904–1906) Value of, *May 13*, 636.
Africa, West—Volta District, Trade with, Effect and Incidence of Canoe Tax and Salt Tax, *May 8*, 216.

**Hilsea**
War Office Land, Letting of.
*Qs.* Mr. Bramsdon; *As.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 16*, 1093.

**Hills, Mr. J. W.** [Durham]
Imperial Conference, 1907—*Précis* of Proceedings, Publication of, Responsibility for Making, *May 13*, 621.

**Hobhouse, Mr. C. E.**—*Under-Secretary for India* [Bristol, E.]
Budget, Proposals as to Taking—Date of Issue of, Explanatory Memorandum, etc., *May 7*, 59.
Punjab Land Revenue System, Effect of, *May 16*, 1097.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1516–1521, 1529, 1556, 1561–1563.
Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1686, 1693–1696.

**Holt, Mr.** [Northumberland, Hexham]
Post Office Mail Service to Hong Kong, Complaints as to, *May 14*, 793.

**Home Office**
*Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone,
*Under-Secretary*—Mr. H. Samuel.

**Hops**
Act of 1866, Administration of, Reason for Non-Application of to Foreign Hops.
*Qs.* Mr. Courthope, *May 23*, 1168, 1175, 1202; Sir E. Strachey, 1189–1192.
*Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 29*, 1646, 1647.

**House of Commons**
*See under* Parliament.

**House of Lords**
*See under* Parliament.

**House of Lords (Reform) Bill**
*l.* 2R., *May 7*, 3.
Bill withdrawn, *May 7*, 42.

**House of Lords (Reform) Bill**
*Debate on Second Reading* [Lords], *May 7*, 3.
Functions of the Upper Chamber, 35.
Irish Church Bill of 1869, and Irish Home Rule Bill of 1893, Attitude of House of Lords towards, 15.
Life Peers, proposed Creation of, 38.
Mandate for Alteration in Constitution of the House, 5, 17, 33.
Party Character of the House, 26–29.

[*cont.*

**House of Lords Reform Bill**—*cont.*
*Debate on Second Reading* [Lords]—*cont.*
Relations Between Lords and Commons, Government Proposals for Readjustment of, 6, 7, 10, 11, 19–25, 30, 32.
Select Committee to Consider Reform Proposals, Appointment of, proposed, 3, 6, 14, 18, 42.
Spiritual Peers, Proposals as to Selection of Representatives, 8.

**Howard de Walden, Lord**
Took the Oath, *May 13*, 533.

**Hull**
Dock Dredgings, Detriment Caused by Place of Deposit of.
*Qs.* Mr. A. S. Wilson; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 28*, 1474, 1475.

**Hull and Barnsley Railway Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 8*, 197.

**Hunt, Mr. R.** [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Admiralty Contracts—Articles for which Contractors are not bound to use British Materials, *May 13*, 604.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 871–876.
Fiscal Policy
Adaptation of, to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 14*, 871–876.
Industries of the Country, Effect of Free Trade System on, *May 14*. 872–876.
Inland Revenue Department Supervising Officers—Memorial for Inquiry into Conditions of Service and Pay, *May 16*, 1146–1148.
Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 507.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Intro.*, *May 27*, 1447.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill *Com.*, *May 28*, 1554, 1563, 1568.
Transvaal, Volunteer Force, Proposals for Raising, *May 13*, 607.

**Imperial Conference, 1907**
Australasian Naval Squadron, Understanding as to.
*Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. J. C. Wason, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 13*, 603.
Chancellor of the Exchequer, Address by
Australian Imports of British Goods in 1906, and Value affected by proposed Scheme.
*Q.* Mr. Arkwright; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 8*, 213, 214.
Figures Given, Method of Obtaining.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 8*, 213.

**Imperial Conference, 1907**—*cont.*
*Daily Mail* Report of Incident of 14th inst. Veracity of.
*Q.* Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 15*, 953.
*Q.* Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 16*, 1097.
Delegates, Control over—Political Meeting Addressed by Dr. Smartt.
*Q.* Mr. H. Pearson; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *May 16*, 1111, 1112.
Emigration Agents, Payments to—Objections to Practice.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 13*, 601.
Entertainment of Colonial Ministers, Provision of Cost of—Designation of Premiers as Guests of the Nation or of the Government.
*Qs.* Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1635.
Irish Home Rule, Attitude towards.
*Q.* Mr. Walker; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 8*, 214.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 13*, 601.
Mackay, Sir J., Circumstances of Attendance of—Authority for Statements on Preference, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, Sir H. Vincent, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 8*, 210, 211.
Papers Laid before—Copy Presented, *May 29*, 1612.
Preferential Treatment
Attitude of the Home Government towards.
*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 663; Mr. McKenna, 669–672; Mr. E. Cecil, 674–677; Mr. Barnes, 677, 678; Mr. Lyttelton, 694, 695; Mr. Lambton, 695, 698; Sir E. Sassoon, 699–700; Mr. Buxton, 720, 721; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, *May 14*, 827–829; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 835.
Colonial Policy as to—Offers Made by Premiers to Admit British Goods on Special Terms.
*Q.* Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 622, 623.
Proceedings, Proposals for Publication of—Dissatisfaction with Abridgement Issued by Colonial Office, etc.
*Qs.* Sir H. Vincent, Mr. P. Pease, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 8*, 211–213.

[*cont.*

**Imperial Conference, 1907**—*cont.*
Proceedings, etc.—*cont.*
Minutes, Presented, *May 29*, 1612.
*Précis* of Proceedings, Publication of and Responsibility for Making.
*Qs.* Viscount Turnour; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 13*, 573, 574.
*Qs.* Mr. Hills, Sir G. Parker, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. H. Cox; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 621.
*Qs.* Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 16*, 1097, 1098.
Publication *in extenso*, Decision as to.
*Qs.* Sir H. Vincent, Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 622.
Publicity, Discussion on — Proposal as to Printing.
*Q.* Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1636.
Report, Date of Issue, etc.
*Q.* Colonel Harrison-Broadley; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 23*, 1162.
Verbatim Report, Date of Presenting.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 16*, 1098.
Proceedings and *Précis*, Presented, *May 16*, 1070, 1078; *May 28*, 1453.
Result of Negotiations, Lack of Adequate Information, etc.
*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 662.

**Imported Watchcases Bill**
c. 1R.* *May 14*, 804.

**Imports and Exports**
*See* Exports and Imports.

**Inch, East**
Reinstatement Claim of B. Galvin.
*Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 779, 780.

**Inchiquin, Lord, Estate of**
Rent-recovery Proceedings, Allegations as to Threat of.
*Qs.* Mr. Halpin; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 230.

**Income-Tax**
Aggregate of Incomes lying between £160 and £700.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 957, 958.
Assessment on Trades, etc., recently commenced
Resolution Reported, *May 8*, 273.
Authors' Royalties, Definition of.
*Q.* Mr. Arnold-Forster; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 16*, 1086.

**Income-Tax**—*cont.*
Average Yield of.
*Os.* Mr. Asquith, *May 14*, 852.
Collection—Proposals as to Assimilating English and Scotch Systems.
*Os.* Mr. G. Faber, *May 8*, 253, 254; Mr. Asquith, 253; Mr. A. Cross, 258-260.
Continuance of, at 1s. in the £.
*Resolution*, [Mr. Asquith], *May 8*, 245.
Co-operative Trading Societies, Assessment of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 8*, 206.
Earned Income of over £2,000 from Business belonging to Several Persons, which on division provides each with Income under that Sum, Method of taxing.
*Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 631.
Earned Incomes not exceeding £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £.
*Os.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, *May 8*, 249; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 659–661; Mr. Barnes, 679, 680.
Pensions, Annuities, etc., Position of.
*Os.* Mr. Rees, *May 8*, 254, 255; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 660.
Shares in Limited Companies taken as Part Earnings, Position of.
*Os.* Mr. Harmood-Banner, *May 8*, 250; Mr. Myer, 262.
Foreign Investments, Taxation of, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Bottomley, *May 13*, 688.
Graduation, Necessity for.
*Os.* Mr. C. Money, *May 14*, 816, 817; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 842, 843.
Inclusion of all Offices and Employments in Schedule E
Resolution Reported, *May 8*, 273.
Limitation on Aggregate Amount of Deductions for wear and tear.
Resolution Reported, *May 8*, 273.
New Proposals—Decision as to Re-arrangement of Staff.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 593.
Permanency of, at 1s. in the £.
*Os.* Mr. Fell, *May 8*, 246, 247; Mr. Asquith, 248; Mr. Everett, 251, 252; Mr. G. Faber, 252; Sir J. Jardine, 260; Sir T. Lowe, 261: Mr. Buxton, *May 13*, 724.
Poor Rates, Copies of—Cost of providing for Income-Tax Purposes.
*Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *May 16*, 1142, 1143; Mr. Runciman, 1142, 3143, 1144; Mr. C. Hay, 1142; Mr. Morton, 1143.

[*cont.*

**Income Tax**—*cont.*

Reduction of to 11d. in the £, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. S. Roberts, *May 8*, 245; Mr. Fell, 246; Mr. Asquith, 247–249.

Refund, Facilitating Process of, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. P. Pease, *May 14*, 887, 888.

Repayment

Abolition of Repayment in Respect of Assessment on Average Income.

Resolution Reported, *May 8*, 273.

Increase (1904–1906), Cause of.
*Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 631.

Number under Section 133 during 1904, 1905 and 1906.
*Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Asquith *May 8*, 218.

Returns—Declaration of Total Income' Objections to.
*Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *May 8*, 256–258.

Statutory Declarations, Objections to Method of issuing Demand Notes, etc.
*Os.* Mr. C. Hay, *May 16*, 1143–1146.

Three Years Average System, Working of, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Watt, Mr. A. Cross; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *May 7*, 65, 66.

Unearned Income, Rate to be levied on.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 7*, 65.

**Income Tax Act, 1842**

Section 133, Effect of Clause 28 and Third Schedule of Finance Bill upon.
*Q.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 630.

**India**

Accounts and Estimates (1907–8)—Explanatory Memorandum Presented, *May 13*, 534, 569.

Amritsar—Number of Licences issued for Sale of Spirits.
*Q.* Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 14*, 772.

Army

Expenditure in 1870, 1880, 1890, 1900, and 1906.
*Q.* Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1623.

Officers on Leave in England—Rule as to drawing Pay.
*Q.* Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 15*, 946, 947.

Arrests and Imprisonments without Trial during last eighty-nine Years.
*Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 15*, 949.

**India**—*cont.*

Assam—Trade Route *via* Russia into China, Proposals for opening up.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 15*, 930.

Bengal, Eastern—Disturbances in Mymensingh District, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with.
*Qs.* Sir H. Cotton, Mr. A. J. Balfour; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 8*, 209, 210.

Bombay

City Native Police, Proposals for Improving conditions of Service of.
*Q.* Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 23*, 1160.

Political Service, Pay of Military Officers in.
*Q.* Sir S. King; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1627.

Budget, Proposals as to taking—Date of Issue of Explanatory Memorandum, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Bryce, Mr. Ellis, Sir C. Dilke; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *May 7*, 58, 59.
*Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 27*, 1334.

Place and Date of Preparation, Explanatory Memorandum of.
*Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 15*, 929.

Statement, Date of Presenting.
*Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 15*, 929.

Time to be allotted to discussing.
*Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 29*, 1655, 1656.

Cantonment Act, 1899, Amendment of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1629.

Cantonment Magistrates, Duties and Powers of.
*Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1630.

Condition of—Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion.
*Qs.* Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 15*, 980, 981.

Blocking Motion of Member for Montgomery Boroughs, Removal of, proposed.
*Qs.* Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees, Mr. Moore; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 15*, 981, 982.

Darjeeling—Government Aid to St. Paul's School.
*Q.* Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 27*, 1313.

[*cont.*

**India**—*cont.*

Factory Labour, Conditions of—Result of Inquiry.
*Q.* Sir A. Torrance; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 28*, 1645.

Financial Statement Presented, *May 7*, 50.

Finance and Revenue Accounts (1905–6) Presented, *May 9*, 335; *May 13*, 535.

Flogging as Judicial Punishment—Reply to Despatch.
*Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 27*, 1312.

Home Accounts Presented, *May 9*, 335; *May 13*, 535.

Irrigation, Net Revenue from in 1881–2, 1901–2 and 1906–7.
*Q.* Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1625, 1626.

Land Revenue in 1856, 1875, 1895, and 1905.
*Q.* Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1621, 1622.

Moral and Material Progress

Date of Presenting Statement.
*Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 15*, 929.

Statement (1905–6), Presented, *May 10*, 462; *May 13*, 535.

Plague

Deaths from in April and since 1896.
*Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 15*, 949.

Memorandum of Royal College of Physicians—Return Ordered, *May 15*, 928—Order discharged and Return of Memorandum Ordered, *May 29*, 1612.

Police—Decision as to Period for Retirement.
*Q.* Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 13*, 593.

Punjab

Lahore Disturbances

Cause of—Arrests made, etc.
*Q.* Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 13*, 577.
*Qs.* Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 15*, 949, 950.

Lalu Lajpat Rai, Circumstances of Arrest of.
*Qs.* Dr. Rutherford, Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1633, 1634.

Land Colonisation Bill, Tabling Copy of, etc., proposed.
*Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1630.

Land Revenue System, Effect of.
*Qs.* Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 13*, 577; *May 15*, 928.
*Qs.* Mr. J. O'Donnell, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Hobhouse, *May 16*, 1096, 1097.

**India**—*cont.*

Punjab—*cont.*

Rawal Pindi

Land Revenue in 1861, 1881, and 1901.
*Q.* Mr. C. J. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1624.

Land Tax and Irrigation Cess, Charges under.
*Qs.* Mr. C. J. O'Donnell, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1632, 1633.

Riots, Cause of.
*Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1633.

Unrest in, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with—Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. O'Grady, Mr. W. Redmond, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Lupton, Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. Morley, Mr. Speaker, *May 13*, 612–619.
*Q.* Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 14*, 784.

Railways

Bombay-Sind Line, Cutch Route, Correspondence as to, Memorial from Inhabitants, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Weir; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 29*, 1629, 1630, 1631.

Rolling Stock, Suggestion for Obviating Inadequacy of.
*Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 9*, 345.

Railways and Irrigation Works under Construction, and proposed Expenditure thereon—Return Ordered, *May 9*, 336; Presented, *May 13*, 569.

Revenue and Expenditure 1906–7 Compared with 1905–6—Estimate presented, *May 9*, 335; *May 13*, 535.

State Prisoners

Particulars of—Return Ordered, *May 28*, 1463.

Regulations Governing Confinement of.
*Qs.* Dr. Rutherford, Mr. O'Grady; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 13*, 612.

Telegraph Rates to, proposals as to Reduction of.
*Os.* Mr. Rees, *May 9*, 426; Mr. Buxton, 428.

**India Office**

*Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. J. Morley.
*Under-Secretary*—Mr. C. E. H. Hobhouse.

**Industrial Diseases. Compensation for**
Report of Committee, Presented, *May 15*, 922, 927.

**Infant Mortality**
Statistics as to certain Boroughs (1897–1906).
*Q.* Mr. Ridsdale; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 29*, 1616.

**Injured Animals Act (1894) Amendment Bill**
c. 1R.* *May 29*, 1657.

**Inland Revenue Department**
Supervising Officers—Memorial for Inquiry into Conditions of Service and Pay.
*Qs.* Mr. C. Hay, *May 16*, 1145, 1147; Mr. Hunt, 1146–1148; Mr. Runciman, 1147.
Vote for, *May 16*, 1142.

**Insurance**
Industrial Companies, Complaints against Business Methods of—Inquiry proposed.
*Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 13*, 638.

**Inverclyde, Lord**
Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *May 28*, 1458.

**Inverness-shire**
Sanatorium—Interdict Granted against Parish Council of Boleskine and Cleertarf.
*Q.* Mr. J. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 14*, 799.

**Ireland**
*Chief Secretary*—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.
*Lord-Lieutenant*—Earl of Aberdeen.
*Attorney-General*—Rt Hon. R. R. Cherry.
*Solicitor-General*—Mr. R. Barry.
[*For* particular Places, Estates, etc., *see their names*]
Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*
Ancient Monuments
Arrangements for Preservation of.
*Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 13*, 583, 584.
Number on Estates being sold under Act of 1903.
*Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 27*, 1301.
Banking and Railway Statistics—Report Presented, *May 27*, 1294, *May 28*, 1453.
Church Temporalities—*see under* Land Commission.
Condition of
Facilities for Parliamentary Discussion, etc.
*Qs.* Capt. Craig, Mr. Mooney, Viscoutn Turnour, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Sir H. Campbell - Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *May 15*, 979, 980.

**Ireland**—*cont.*
Condition of—*cont.*
Remarks of Mr. Justice Ross, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Capt. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1647, 1648.
Congested Districts Commission—Report Presented, *May 23*, 1152; *May 28*, 1452.
Constabulary, Royal Irish, *see that title.*
County and Borough Council grants, Deductions from in Respect of Land Purchase—proposals for Obviating in future, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 13*, 586.
Court-houses—Vesting in County Councils, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 594.
Deputy-Lieutenants—Return as to Names and Occupations, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr Birrell, *May 10*, 467.
Devolution Scheme of Lord Dunraven, Circulation of Copy of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 779.
Drainage, Arterial
Appendix to Report of Commission, Proposals for Circulating.
*Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 205.
Necessity for Dealing with the matter.
*Qs.* Mr. J. Redmond, *May 13*, 122, 123.
Education, *see that title.*
English Government Departments and Authorities Exercising Powers in.
*Q.* Mr. G. Clark; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 16*, 1079.
Return Ordered, *May 29*, 1612.
Estimates—Surpluses on Votes Surrendered since 1903, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 941.
Evictions
Legislative proposals for Dealing with, and Date of presenting Special Report.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 594–595.
Reinstatement Claims, Result of Investigation into.
*Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1650.
Return, Presented, *May 13*, 534, 569.
Financial Relations with Great Britain
Miscellaneous Revenue during last ten years.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 935.

[*cont.*

**Ireland**—*cont.*
Financial Relations, etc.—*cont.*
Revenue and Expenditure for Last Twenty Years.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15,* 940.
Forestry Department, Creation of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13,* 597.
Government Buildings, Use of Irish Materials in Constructing.
*Q.* Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 14,* 777, 778.
Grazing Farms
Cattle Driven off, During May and Number Receiving Police Protection.
*Qs.* Capt. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29,* 1652, 1653.
Disturbances in Connection with Letting—Change of Venue in Trial of Cases, etc.
*Q.* Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 29,* 1655.
Number under Police Protection on 1st inst.
*Q.* Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 7,* 73, 74.
*Q.* Mr. Arkwright; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8,* 238.
*Qs.* Mr. C. Craig Mr. Moore, Mr. John O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *May 15,* 973, 974.
*Qs.* Mr. Arkwright, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15,* 977, 978.
Hospitals
Grant to, Information as to.
*Os.* Capt. Craig, *May 16,* 1148.
Vote for, *May 16,* 1148.
Iveagh-Pirrie Motor Scheme, Communication Recently Received as to.
*Qs.* Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15,* 973.
Labourers Acts and Cottages, *see title* Labourers (Ireland) Acts.
Land Commission, Land Judges Court, Land Purchase, *see those titles.*
Loan Capital Duty Claimed from District Councils, Non-assessment of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15,* 936.
Local Government Electors in each Parliamentary Constituency.
*Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14,* 776.
Lord-Lieutenant and Chief Secretary, Powers of, as to Appointments and Dismissals in Certain Departments.
*Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15,* 977.
Moonlighting Disturbances in Certain Districts—Arrests made by Police, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13,* 582.

**Ireland**—*cont.*
Petty Sessions Courts, Right of Chairmanship in.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13,* 598.
Privy Councillors, Names of.
*Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 10,* 468.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14,* 778.
Quit Rents, Accumulated Funds Derived from and Expenditure of.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15,* 935.
Religious Opinions and Names of Officials, Information as to.
*Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 10,* 467, 468.
Solicitors' Licence Duty, Abolition of, proposed.
*Qs.* Mr. O'Doherty, Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *May 15,* 932, 933.
Works Board
System of Appointing Clerks in—Allegations against Sir R. Holmes.
*Q.* Mr. Delany, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 8,* 240.
Vote for, *May 23,* 1228.

**Irish Council Bill**
*c.* Intro., *May 7,* 78.
1 R.* *May 7,* 195.
Administrative Function under Clause 21 (2).
*Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15,* 939.
*Debate on Introduction* [Commons], *May 7,* 78.
Administrative Representative Council proposed, Establishment of, 89, 106, 172, 179.
Chief Secretary to have Right to be Present at Meetings and to Speak, 90.
Committees, Power to Set up, 92, 119, 120.
Eighty-two elected Members and Twenty-six Nominated Members, Proposals as to, 90, 110, 116, 117, 181.
Functions of, 90–92, 118.
Lord-Lieutenant, Position of, 106, 107, 158.
Power of Lord-Lieutenant to reserve Questions for Consideration, 91, 118, 166, 182.
President to be appointed by the Council, 90.
System of Electing and Nominating Members, 90, 107.
Under Secretary to Lord-Lieutenant to be an Ex-officio Member of, 90.

[*cont.*

**Irish Council Bill**—*cont.*
*Debate on Introduction* [Commons]—*cont.*

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *Status* and Functions of, 85, 86, 173.

Association of the Sentiment of the Irish People as a whole with the Administration of the Country, Aim of the Bill, 79, 105, 116, 153, 165, 180.

Boards at present engaged in Administration of Irish Business, Number and Functions of, 83–84, 104.

Commissioners of National Education, *Status* and Functions of, 88.

Congested Districts Board, *Status* and Functions of, 86.

Constituencies for Election of Members, proposed Distribution of, 93.

Departments and Boards subject to Provisions of the Bill, 84–89.

Development Fund Grant, Present Allocation of, 98.

Dublin Castle Admnistration, Failure of, 80–83, 104, 114, 155, 156.

Education Department, new, proposed Establishment of, 92, 93, 120, 121, 138, 173, 184.

Funds for Purposes of the Act, Proposals as to, 94–98, 122, 137.

Audit of, Provision for, 97.

Grant of £650,000 per annum, Allocation of, 95, 96, 110, 111, 122, 125, 157.

Home Rule

Definition of, 114, 162.

Stepping Stone to, alleged, 102, 131–136, 147, 148, 154, 159.

Intermediate Education Board, *Status* and Functions of, 88.

Irish Unionist Party, Attitude towards, 130–144, 152, 160, 177.

Labour Party, Attitude towards, 128–130.

Land Purchase Stock, Loss on Flotation, Burden imposed on Development Fund by, 98–100, 126.

Legislative Power or Authority not set up by the Bill, 78, 115, 154.

Local Government Board, amended *Status* and Functions of, 85.

Nationalist Party, Attitude towards the Bill, 113–128, 149, 168, 169.

Office of Lord-Lieutenant to be held without Reference to Religious Belief, proposed, 100.

Public Works Department

Grant of £300,000 to, Proposals as to, 96, 122.

*Status* and Functions of, 87.

**Irish Council Bill**—*cont.*
*Debate on Introduction* [Commons]—*cont.*

Treasury, Irish, Proposed Establishment of, 94, 121, 136.

Ulster, Position of, 139–145, 150–153, 160–162.

Departments not under Control of, Information as to Expenditure on Land Purchase, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 779; *May 27*, 1304.

Discussion, Facilities for.
*Qs.* Capt. Craig; *As.* Mr. Asquith, Mr. Speaker, *May 13*, 643.

Eight Departments proposed to be dealt with

Annual Income of.
*Qs.* Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 779; *May 27*, 1304.
*Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 933.
*Q.* Mr. M. G. Clark; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 937.
*Q.* Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 965.

Local Habitation of.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 16*, 1087.

Powers and Duties of.
*Q.* Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 16*, 1086, 1087.

Election, Cost of and Charge for Expenditure.
*Q.* Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 937.
*Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1647.

Electoral Divisions, Basis for Distributing.
*Q.* Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 933.
*Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 16*, 1089.

Financial Provisions—Proposals as to Equivalent Grant, etc.
*Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 976.

Grant

Scottish Contribution towards.
*Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 14*, 800.

Source of providing.
*Q.* Capt. Waring; *A.* Mr. Asquith. *May 9*, 373.
*Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 581.

Irish Treasury, Proposals for Control of.
*Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 976.

Lord-Lieutenant, Powers of, in Regard to New Council.
*Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 16*, 1088.

[*cont.*

**Irish Council Bill**—*cont.*
  Printing, Course followed in.
    *Q.* Mr. Moore; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 29,* 1656.
  Privy Council, Judicial Committee, Powers to be conferred on.
    *Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 16,* 1087.
  Second Reading, Date of taking.
    *Q.* Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 23,* 1166.

**Irish Education Act, 1892**
  Fines, Circular as to Disposal of.
    *Q.* Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 7,* 74.

**Irish Tobacco Bill**
  *l.* 2R., *May 7,* 45.

**Irvinestown**
  Reinstatement Claim of Francis Gallagher.
    *Q.* Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14,* 778.

**Italy**
  Trade Reports Presented, *May 13,* 534; *May 28,* 1451.

**"Iverna"**
  Live Animals carried by, on Passage of June 11th, 1906.
    *Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 23,* 1157.

**Jackson, Mr. R. S.** [Greenwich]
  Cattle Importation Regulations, Effect of on Work in Cattle Markets, etc., *May 23,* 1182.

**Jamaica**
  Earthquake—Decision as to Government Grant.
    *Q.* Mr. O. C. Philipps; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8,* 218.
  Swettenham, Sir A.
    Censure by Lord Elgin, Offer made to Withdraw.
      *Q.* Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8,* 214.
    Telegram as to Action, Procedure taken in sending to United States by War Office.
      *Q.* Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 8,* 214.

**James of Hereford, Lord**
  Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill, Second Reading, Date of Taking, *May 15,* 925.

**Japan**
  Tokio—Qualifications of Medical Officer to British Embassy.
    *Qs.* Sir W. J. Collins, Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *May 14,* 787.
  Trade Report Presented, *May 28,* 1451.

**Jardine, Sir J.** [Roxburgh]
  Income Tax, Permanency of, at 1s. in the £, *May 8,* 260.

**Johnson, Mr. W.** [Warwickshire, Nuneaton]
  Births, Certificates, Charges for—Procedure in Applying under Factory and Workshop Act, *May 15,* 944.
  Finance Bill, 2R., *May 3,* 731.

**Johnston Estate**
  Reinstatement Claim of J. O'Brien.
    *Q.* Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13,* 599.

**Jones, Mr. L.** [Westmoreland, Appleby]
  Camberwell Infirmary, etc., Cost of *May 16,* 1100.
  Government Property—Rates on Houses occupied by Foreign Representatives, *May 16,* 1115.
  Gravesend Water-guard Inspector—Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16,* 1130.
  Mint—Loss on Silver Coinage, Allowance to Bullion Brokers, etc., *May 16,* 1118.
  Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8,* 297.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com., May 29,* 1710.
  Water Supply in Rural Districts, Difficulty of Securing—Legislation to deal with Matter proposed, *May 9,* 361.

**Judicial Statistics**
  Civil Judicial Statistics (England and Wales) Presented, *May 8,* 198, 202.

**Juvenile Offenders**
  Treatment of, Extension of Reformatory System.
    *Os.* Mr. Cochrane, *May 23,* 1224; Mr. Gladstone, 1222; Mr. Byles, 1226.

**Kearley, Mr. H. E.**—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Trade* [Devonport]
  English Cotton Trade—Amount paid per Week in Wages, *May 8,* 222.
  Exports and Imports
    Imports from the Colonies in 1905, *May 8,* 1222.
    Military Stations Abroad, Record kept of Exports for use of, *May 8,* 222.
  Gambling in Options and Futures—American Legislation against, Issuing as Return proposed, *May 8,* 205.
  London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 25,* 1414.
  Muslins Exported to Germany and Re-imported after Finishing—Extent of Trade, *May 23,* 1164.
  Trade and Commerce—Machinery Classification in Annual Statement, *May 23,* 1163.

**Keiss**
School Teacher, Cause for Dismissal of.
*Q.* Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 28*, 1477.

**Kekewich, Sir G. W.** [Exeter]
Civil Service Boy Clerks, Reply to Memorial from, *May 14*, 798.
Crown Lands, Letting, Arrangements for, *May 14*, 771.
Halsall Charity Scheme, Cause for Delay in Preparing, *May 14*, 796.

**Kellet's Estate**
Purchase proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1109.

**Kendal Corporation Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 7*, 48.
2R.* *May 23*, 1150.

**Kennaway, Sir J. H.** [Devonshire, Honiton]
Congo Free State, Belgian Administration, Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives—Responsibility of Great Britain, *May 15*, 984–986.
Rural Districts, Depopulation of, Causes of, Statistics as to, and Necessity for dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 314.
Small Holdings Act of 1892, Failure of, *May 8*, 314.

**Kennedy, Mr. V. P.** [Cavan, W.]
Antrim Post Office—Application of T. Connolly for Transfer, *May 7*, 50.
Brackey Post Office, position of, *May 13*, 587.
Cavan
Railway Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 13*, 589.
Surcharge for Maintenance of Francis McDonald, *May 13*, 595.
Imperial Conference, 1907
Emigration Agents, Payments to—Objections to Practice, *May 13*, 601.
Irish Home Rule, Attitude Towards, *May 13*, 601.
Income Tax, New Proposals—Decision as to Rearrangement of Staff, *May 13*, 593.
Irish Solicitors' Licence Duty, Abolition of, proposed, *May 15*, 932.
Meath and Galway County Surveyorships, Procedure in Applying for, *May 13*, 598.
Morley Estate, Purchase proposals for, *May 15*, 976.
Petty Sessions Courts, Rights of Chairmanship in, *May 13*, 598.
Valuation, Quinquennial, Postponement of, proposed, *May 13*, 591.

**Kenyon-Slaney, Colonel** [Shropshire, Newport]
Rural Districts, Depopulation of, Causes of, Statistics as to, and Necessity for Dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 322.
Small Holdings, Demand for, Rents Charged per Acre, etc., *May 8*, 323, 324.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1437–1439.
Land Court, Limiting Expenses in Respect of to £6,000 per annum, *May 27*, 1355.
Salaries, Limiting Expenses in Respect of Agricultural Commissioners to £3,000 per Annum, *May 27*, 1344.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1489, 1521–1523, 1567, 1568; *May 29*, 1729.
Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1696–1698.

**Kensington Borough Council (Superannuation) Bill**
*l. Rep.** *May 7*, 1.
3R.* *May 14*, 733.
*c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 766.
2R.* *May 28*, 1460.

**Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill**
*l. Rep.** *May 14*, 733.

**Kettle, Mr. T. M.** [Tyrone, E.]
Land Purchase—Effect of Valuation under Section 16 of Finance Act, 1894, *May 27*, 1333.

**Kew Gardens**
Assistant Director, Reason for Appointment of.
*Os.* Mr. Summerbell, *May 23*, 1205; Mr. Cave, 1206; Sir E. Strachey, 1206, 1207.
Employees, Wages of and Hours of Duty of Stokers.
*Qs.* Mr. Summerbell, Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 15*, 963, 964.
Gardeners, Rate of Pay, proposals as to Increasing, etc.
*Os.* Mr. Summerbell, *May 23*, 1205, 1207; Dr. Rutherford, 1205; Mr. Cave, 1206; Mr. C. Duncan, 1206, 1209; Sir E. Strachey, 1207, 1208; Mr. Carlile, 1209, 1210.
Sunday Labour at, Objections to.
*Os.* Mr. McCallum, *May 23*, 1211.
Vote for, *May 23*, 1167.

**Kilcreggan**
War Office Purchase of Land, Particulars of.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 29*, 1627.

**Kildysert**
Hayrick, Malicious burning of—Prosecutions made, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1648, 1649.

**Kilkenny**
Evictions and Re-instatements, Information as to.
*Q.* Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 580.
Postal Communication with Castlecomer, Improvement of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 7*, 51.

**Kilmore**
Demonstration against Mr. S. Russell, Proceedings pending in connection with.
*Q.* Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 969.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1110.

**Kimber, Sir H.** [Wandsworth]
Land Transfer Act, 1897, Working of, in London, *May 27*, 1299.

**King, Sir H. S.** [Hull, Central]
India
Army Officers on Leave in England—Rule as to drawing Pay, *May 15*, 946.
Bombay Political Service, Pay of Military Officers in, *May 29*, 1627.
Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 707–709.

**King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill**
*c.* 2R.* *May 13*, 567.

**King's County**
Incendiary Fires during last six Months, Particulars of.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1105, 1106.

**King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Council Bill**
*c.* Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *May 9*, 333.
*Con.** *May 23*, 1150.
3R.* *May 27*, 1293.
*l.* 1R.* *May 28*, 1450.

**Kinsgton-upon-Hull Corporation Bill**
*c. Con.*, *May 13*, 701.
3R.* *May 16*, 1075.
*l.* 1R.* *May 16*, 1069.

**Knocknacolon**
Sale Proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 346, 347.

**Korea**
Japanese Cotton Goods, Allegations as to Subsidy on.
*Q.* Sir F. Cawley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 16*, 1098.

**Labourers Act**
Fund, Sums Transferred to—Information as to Investment, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 239.

**Laidlaw, Mr. R.** [Renfrew, E.]
India
Bombay City Native Police, Proposals for improving Conditions of Service of, *May 23*, 1160.
Darjeeling—Government Aid to St. Paul's School, *May 27*, 1313.
Post Office Mail Service—New Arrangements for Eastern Mail Packet Contract, *May 27*, 1324.

**Lamb, Mr. E. H.** [Rochester]
Naval Dockyard Writers—Effect of New Scheme of Pay, etc., *May 16*, 1083, 1084.

**Lambert Minors Estate**
Grass Lands cleared of Stock on 9th instant—Proceedings taken by Police, etc.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 16*, 1110, 1111.

**Lambton, Mr. F. W.** [Durham, S.E.]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 695–699.
Fiscal Policy—Adaptation to present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 13*, 696–699.
Imperial Conference, 1907—Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government towards, *May 13*, 695, 698.

**Lancashire**
Polling Districts, Order altering, Presented, *May 16*, 1070, 1077.

**Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill**
*c. Rep.** *May 8*, 201.
*Con.** *May 15*, 926.
3R.* *May 23*, 1150.
*l.* 1R.* *May 28*, 1449.

**Lancaster, Duchy of**
*Chancellor*—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

**Land in England and Wales**
Legislative Proposals—Inclusion of Provision for dealing with Hardships of Urban Tenants.
*Q.* Mr. Maclean; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 16*, 1111.

[*cont.*

**Land in England and Wales**—*cont.*
Registration System, Revision of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. G. Greenwood; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *May 27*, 1325, 1326.
Small Holdings, *see that title.*

**Land Commission (Ireland)**
[*See also names of Places and Estates.*]
Church Temporalities Fund—Allocation of Surplus Income.
*Qs.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 578; *May 27*, 1302.
Commissioners, Names and Religion of.
*Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell *May 13*, 602.

**Land Judges Court, Ireland**
[*For* particular Estates *see their names.*]
Sale of Estates, Procedure taken for.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 226.

**Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill**
Proposals as to.
*Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1650, 1651.

**Land Purchase, Ireland**
[*See also names of places, Estates, etc.*]
Advances
Information as to Amounts granted, *Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1651.
Means of ascertaining Security for, in certain cases.
*Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 226.
Returns Presented, *May 24*, 1231; *May 27*, 1295; *May 28*, 1453.
Annuities, Total Amount of.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 27*, 1332.
Arrears, Proceedings taken for Recovery of (1903-1907).
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 227.
Demesnes, Mansions, etc., coming into Estates Commissioners hands since 1903.
*Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 345.
Drennan, Mr. J. T., Salary of
*Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 348.
Finance, Opportunity for Discussion.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 14*, 771.
Grazing Farms surrendered through Intimidation, Postponement of State Purchase of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. W. Moore; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 799, 800.

**Land Purchase, Ireland**—*cont.*
Stock, Correct Designation of.
*Q.* Mr. Walker; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 15*, 946.
Tenant Right, Procedure in Valuing.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 228.
Transactions effected.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1651.
Treasury Rules under Act of 1903—Discussion of Amendments, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 8*, 241.
Valuation System under Section 16 of Finance Act, 1894, Effect of.
*Q.* Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 27*, 1333.
Zone System, Facilities for Fraud given by and Proposals for Prevention of inclusion of Extraneous Debts in Prices.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 8*, 240.

**Land Tax**
Friendly Societies, Regulations as to Exemption of.
*Q.* Mr. Thornton; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 9*, 356.

**Land Transfer Act, 1897**
Working of, in London.
*Q.* Sir H. Kimber; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *May 27*, 1299.

**Land Values (Scotland) Bill**
*c.* Intro., *May 13*, 646.
1R.* *May 13*, 651.
Printing, Cause for Delay in.
*Qs.* Mr. J. D. White, Mr. Barrie; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 29*, 1656.

**Lane-Fox, Mr. G.** [Yorks, W. R., Barkston Ash]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 818–822.
Old-Age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 14*, 821.
Taxation, Necessity for broadening Basis of, *May 14*, 818, 822.
Transvaal
Chinese Labour—Policy of the Colonial Government, *May 15*, 954.
Loan—Date on which Guarantee was promised to General Botha, *May 15*, 954.

**Lansdowne, Marquess of**
Companies Bill, *Rep.*, *May 14*, 762.
House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 7*, 31–39.

[*cont.*

**Lansdowne, Marquess of**—*cont.*
House of Lords Reform Proposals—Government Attitude towards Select Committee of Inquiry, *May 13*, 535.
Municipal Representation Bill—Select Committee, Appointment of certain Lords *May 14*, 763.
Parliamentary Election Disabilities of Seamen, Removal of — Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 13*, 544.
Transvaal Registration Bill—Restrictions imposed on British Indians, Attitude of His Majesty's Government, etc., *May 29*, 1596–1599.

**Lauder and Gumley Estate**
Reinstatement Claim of J. Daly.
*Q.* Mr. T. F. Smyth; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 371.

**Laundries**
Inspection, Legislative Proposals as to.
*Q.* Mr. T. L. Corbett; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 15*, 959.

**Law, Mr. A. B.** [Camberwell, Dulwich]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 893–906.
Fiscal Policy
Adaptation to present condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 14*, 893–905.
Colonial Preference, Question of—Advantages offered by the Colonies, etc., *May 14*, 902–906.
Protection, Advantages of System, *May 14*, 893.
London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 446–450.
Naval Engineer Branch Inquiry—Decision as to publishing Reports, *May 23*, 1158.
Old-Age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 14*, 895, 896.
Taxation—Necessity for widening Basis of, *May 14*, 897–902.

**Law, Mr. H. A.** [Donegal, W.]
Fintown—Charges against Boyle, M'Monagle, and Moy, *May 13*, 571.

**Law Courts**
Ireland—Proposals for Maintenance of Supreme Courts under New Scheme.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 27*, 1302, 1303.
King's Bench Division, Cases standing for Trial in and Proposals for expediting Business.
*Qs.* Mr. Rawlinson; *As.* Sir J. Walton, *May 27*, 1326–1328.
Supreme Court of Judicature
Clerks serving over Forty Years.
*Q.* Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 8*, 224, 225.
Order revoking and amending certain Orders as to Circuits, etc., Presented, *May 28*, 1454, 1462.

**Lea, Mr. H. C.** [St. Pancras, E.]
Smithfield Market, Post Office Premises, Cause for Delay in improving, *May 10*, 463.
Transvaal Mines—Strike of White Miners, Employment of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 27*, 1309, 1310; *May 29*, 1637.

**Lee, Mr. A. H.** [Hampshire, Fareham]
Army Territorial Force—Officers' Privileges as to competing for Commissions in the Regular Army, *May 29*, 1628.
Imperial Conference
Entertainment of Colonial Ministers, Provision of Cost of, etc., *May 29*, 1635.
Proceedings, Proposals for Publication of—Dissatisfaction with Abridgements issued by Colonial Office, etc. *May 8*, 213.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1485.

**Leeds Corporation Bill**
*c. Rep.* May 9*, 333.
*Con.* May 15*, 926.
3R.* *May 22*, 2150.
*l.* 1R.* *May 28*, 1449.

**Leese, Sir J. F.** [Lancashire, N.E., Accrington]
Transvaal Loan, Proposals for granting, *May 9*, 355.

**Lehmann, Mr. R. C.** [Leicester, Market Harborough]
Imperial Conference 1907—Veracity of *Daily Mail* Report of Incident of 14th inst., *May 15*, 953.

**Leicester and District Light Railway**
Order Presented, *May 14*, 734, 768.

**Leigh**
Dog Licence, Cases of T. Leigh and J. W. Lee, Decision given in.
*Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 28*, 1464, 1465.

**Leith Harbour and Docks Bill**
*c.* Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *May 7*, 47.

**Lever, Mr. W. H.** [Cheshire, Wirral]
Old-Age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 470–477, 483, 484.

**Lewis, Island of**
Stornaway Mail Service, Improvement of, proposed.
*Qs.* Mr. Weir, *May 9*, 425, 428; Mr. Buxton, 428.

**Licensing (Ireland) Act, 1902**
*Q.* Mr. H. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 578.

**Liddell, Mr. H.** [Down, W.]
Sligo County Council Printing Contract, Decision of Local Government Board Auditor as to, *May 7*, 75.

**Limited Partnerships**
*Ad Valorem* Stamp Duty—Committee to consider authorising Imposition of, *May 14*, 919.

**Limited Partnerships Bill**
*c.* Reported from Standing Committee A. *May 13*, 646.
*Con.*, *May 15*, 1068.
Stamp Duty Clause inserted without Sanction of a Resolution in Committee —Recommittal of Bill.
*Os.* Mr. Speaker, Lord Balcarres, *May 15*, 1068.

**Lincolnshire**
Crime in—Condition of Brigg Division.
*Q.* Mr. J. Roche, Sir B. Sheffield, Mr. Moore, Mr. Delany, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 8*, 219, 220.

**Liquor Traffic**
Children taken into Public Houses, Result of Inquiry as to.
*Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 28*, 1474.
Licensed Premises — Statistics for 1st January.
*Q.* Mr. C. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 27*, 1320.

**Liverpool**
Bonded Warehouses for Deposit of Wines, and Spirits, Number of and Arrangements for taking charge of.
*Q.* Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 27*, 1297, 1298.
Post Office Temporary Clerks, Conditions of Service.
*Os.* Mr. Seddon, *May 9*, 401, 402.
Slevin, T., Case of—Reason for Detention at Rainhill.
*Q.* Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 13*, 570, 571.

**Liverpool, Earl of**
Sat First in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *May 14*, 733.

**Llanelian**
Schoolmaster, Decision as to Payment of Salary of.
*Q.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 7*, 69, 70.

**Llanelly District Light Railway**
Order presented, *May 14*, 734, 769.

**Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.**—*The President of the Board of Trade* [Carnarvon Boroughs]
Africa, South
Government Stores Imported (1904–1906) Value of, *May 13*, 636.

**Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.**—*cont.*
Africa, South—*cont.*
Trade—Reason for Decline in British Exports, and Proposals for Improving Trade Relations, *May 9*, 359.
Butter sent from Denmark, but Originating in Siberia, Proposals for Preventing Contravention of Act by, *May 27*, 1323.
Cavan, Railway Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 13*, 589.
Dalmuir Level Crossing, Fatality at—Erection of Bridge proposed, *May 27*, 1323.
Germany, Trade with, in 1904 and 1905, *May 24*, 1234.
Hull, Dock Dredgings, Detriment caused by Place of Deposit of, *May 28*, 1474, 1475.
Imports from Colonies and British Possessions, Duty Paid, etc., *May 13*, 570, 637.
Insurance—Industrial Companies, Complaints against Business Methods of, Inquiry proposed, *May 13*, 638.
London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 450–454.
London Municipal Society, Contribution to, by South Metropolitan Gas Company, *May 14*, 791.
Merchant Shipping
British and German Vessels, Passengers carried to United States by, (1904–6), *May 27*, 1322.
Classification of certain Lines, *May 27*, 1322, 1323.
Derelicts at Sea, Danger from, and Proposals as to Searching for, *May 9*, 358.
Merchant Shipping (Tonnage) Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1269, 1270.
Counsel, Proposal for Hearing at Committee Stage, *May 7*, 53.
Cross-Channel Steamers, Exemption of, proposed, *May 7*, 53.
Newbury Railway Station, Improvement of, proposed, *May 29*, 1642.
Port of London—Legislative Proposals for Provision of Dock, *May 29*, 1643.
Railways
Baker Street and Waterloo Trains, Inadequate Accommodation in, *May 7*, 67.
Dangerous Goods, Inclusion of Varnish among—Right of Appeal from Decision, etc., *May 13*, 635.
Engines Running Tender First, Danger Involved by, *May 15*, 945.

[*cont.*

**Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.**—*cont.*
- Railways—*cont.*
  - Metropolitan District
    - Whistles and Sirens, Annoyance caused by, *May 14*, 776.
    - Workmen's Fares charged by, *May 13*, 636.
  - Passengers Luggage, Regulations as to Insurance of, *May 9*, 360.
- State Banking Corporation, Ltd.—Prosecution of Directors, Proposals as to, *May 7*, 53.
- Supply of Electricity Bill—Proposals as to, *May 13*, 637.
- Trade, Board of—Labour Department, Functions of, as to Assisting Workmen to find Work, *May 7*, 68.
- Weights and Measures Act—Final Regulations, Date of Issue of and Cause for Delay, *May 7*, 67.
- Workmens' Trains from Grays and Tilbury—Issue of Tickets, proposed, *May 28*, 466.

**Lobsters**
- Close Time for—Reply to Memorial from Scottish West Coast Fishermen.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 13*, 642.

**Local Authorities**
- Ireland—Power to Accept Tenders not the Lowest submitted.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 337.

**Local Government Board**
- *President*—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Dr. Macnamara.
- Administrative Cost of (1903–1906) and Amount paid to, in Relief of Local Taxation.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 16*, 1101.
- Messengers appointed since 1906.
  - *Q.* Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 15*, 945.
- Pension System—Case of Senior Assistant Clerk.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Thorne, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *May 16*, 1099, 1100.

**Local Government (Ireland)**
- Selection of Candidates for Appointments—Legislation to prohibit Religious Pressure proposed.
  - *Q.* Capt. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 965. 966.
- Vote for, *May 23*, 1228.

**Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 24*, 1229.

**Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 24*, 1229.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill**
- c. *Rep.** *May 9*, 333.
- 3R.* *May 10*, 461.
- l. 1R.* *May 13*, 534.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill**
- c. 2R.* *May 14*, 765.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill**
- c. 2R.* *May 14*, 765.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 7*, 47.
- 2R.* *May 24*, 1229.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 8*, 200.
- 2R.* *May 24*, 1229.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 8*, 200.
- 2R.* *May 24*, 1229.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 8*, 201.
- 2R.* *May 24*, 1229.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 14*, 765.
- 2R.* *May 28*, 1460.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 14*, 765.
- 2R.* *May 28*, 1460.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 13) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 16*, 1075.
- 2R.* *May 28*, 1460.

**Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 14) Bill**
- c. 1R.* *May 16*, 1075.
- 2R.* *May 28*, 1460.

**Local Government (Scotland)**
- Report, Date of Presenting.
  - *Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Shaw, *May 16*, 1103.

**Local Taxation**
  *See* Taxation, Local.

**Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A.** [Essex, Epping]
  Free Labour Association, Contribution to, by London and North Western Railway Company, *May 13*, 644.
  Metropolitan Water Board, Officials transferred, Conditions imposed on, *May 15*, 943.
  Post Office
    Change, Regulations as to Supplying to the Public, *May 9*, 412.
    Motor Vans, Increasing Number of, proposed, *May 9*, 412.
    Parcel Post to China—Arrangements for Registered Parcels, *May 27*, 1299.
    Permanent Officials, Criticisms on Policy of, *May 9*, 410, 411.
    Typists, Women
      Catering Arrangements for, *May 9*, 411, 412.
      Increase in Salaries of, proposed, *May 9*, 411.
  Rural Districts, Depopulation of—Causes, Statistics, and Necessity for dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 319–321.
  Telegraph Service Boy Messengers, New Policy with Regard to—Proposals as to Displacement of Ex-soldiers, *May 9*, 411, 412.
  Woolwich Arsenal Labourers, Minimum Wage of, *May 29*, 1627.

**London**
  Accidents caused by Motors and by Horse-drawn Vehicles during last six Months.
    *Qs.* Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. A. S. Wilson; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 27*, 1318.
  Poor Law Guardians' Powers of appointing Relief Committees.
    *Q.* Mr. Brooks; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 15*, 961.

**London County Council**
  Returns and Estimate of Expenditure (1906–7) Presented, *May 24*, 1231; *May 28*, 1455.

**London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill**
  *c.* 2R., *May 9*, 429; *May 27*, 1407.

**London County Council (Money) Bill**
  *c. Rep.** *May 9*, 333.
    *Con.** *May 15*, 926.

**London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill**
  *c.* 3R.**May 23*, 1150.
  *l.* 1R.* *May 28*, 1449.

**London Municipal Society**
  South Metropolitan Gas Company Contribution to.
    *Q.* Mr. Wiles: *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 14*, 791.

**London United Tramways Bill**
  *c. Rep.** *May 14*, 765.
    *Con.** *May 23*, 1150.
    3R.* *May 27*, 1294.
  *l*; 1R.* *May 28*, 1450.

**London and North Western Railway Bill**
  *c. Rep.** *May 13*, 567.
    *Con.** *May 23*, 1150.
    3R.* *May 27*, 1294.
  *l* 1R.* *May 28*, 1450.

**London and North Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill**
  *l.* 2R.* *May 8*, 197.
    *Rep.** *May 14*, 733.
    3R.* *May 16*, 1069.

**Long, Col. C. W.** [Worcestershire, Evesham]
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Financial Provisions of, *May 16*, 1089.

**Long, Mr. W. H.** [Dublin, S.]
  Business of the House, Course of, *May 27*, 1335.
  Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 183–186.
    Proposals as to, *May 27*, 1334.
  Scots Greys, Decision as to Place of Quartering, *May 14*, 783.
  Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1388–1395, 1436.
    Land Court, Limiting Expenses in Respect of to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1350, 1351.

**Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.** [Armagh, Mid.]
  Africa, South, Trade with—Reason for Decline in British Exports and Proposals for improving Trade Relations, *May 9*, 359.
  Agriculture Department, Vice-President, Appointment of, *May 8*, 236.
  Armagh, Labourer's Cottage Loan, Reason for Delay in sanctioning, *May 15*, 936.
  Australasian Naval Squadron — Understanding arrived at in Conference as to Colonial Contribution, etc., *May 13*, 603.
  Condition of Ireland—Remarks of Mr. Justice Ross, etc., *May 29*, 1647, 1648.
  Congested Districts Board — Appointment and Duties of Mr. T. O. Rorke, *May 15*, 966.
  Constabulary Recruiting Statistics for 1906 and 1907, *May 29*, 1649, 1650.
  Cotton, English Trade in—Amount paid per Week in Wages, *May 8*, 221.

**Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.**—*cont.*

Derelicts at sea, Danger from and Proposals as to searching for, *May 9*, 350, 358.

Elphin United Irish League Meeting, Police Attendance at, etc., *May 15*, 967.

Evictions—Result of Inquiry into Reinstatement Claims, *May 29*, 1650.

Imperial Conference, 1907 — Australasian Naval Squadron, Understanding as to, *May 13*, 603.

India— Assam, Trade Route *via* Rima, into China, Proposals for opening up, *May 15*, 930.

Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 146–153.

Kildysert, Malicious burning of Hay at—Prosecutions made, etc., *May 29*, 1648.

Land Law (Ireland) Act Amendment Bill, Proposals as to, *May 29*, 1650, 1651.

Magistrates—Allegations against Mr. P. J. Kelly, *May 29*, 1649.

Moonlighting Disturbances in certain Districts—Arrests made, etc., *May 13*, 582.

Newmarket on Fergus—Outrage at House of Caretaker Boland, *May 15*, 967.

Rinneen—Shooting Outrage on J. Murphy, *May 15*, 968.

Roscomroe, Grazing Farm held by Mr. Luttrell — Measures taken by Police to protect Cattle, *May 8*, 230; *May 29*, 1649.

Shanghai—Circumstances of Murder of Police Constable Morrow, etc., *May 13*, 626, 627.

**Lord Advocate for Scotland**
*Rt Hon. T. Shaw.*

**Lord Chamberlain**
*Viscount Althorp.*

**Lord Chancellor**
*Lord Loreburn.*

**Lord Chief Justice**
*Lord Alverstone.*

**Lord Great Chamberlain**
*Marquess of Cholmondeley.*

**Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland**
*Earl of Aberdeen.*

**Lord President of the Council**
*Earl of Crewe.*

**Lord Privy Seal**
*Marquess of Ripon.*

**Loreburn, Lord**—*Lord Chancellor*

Companies Bill, *Rep.*, *May 14*, 752, 753, 754, 756, 759, 761. 3R., *May 16*, 1071, 1072.

**Loreburn, Lord**—*cont.*

Destructive Insects and Pests Bill, 3R., *May 13*, 563.

Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 199.

Naturalisation—Anomalies in *Status* of Naturalised British Subjects, Removal of, proposed, *May 15*, 924.

Prize Courts Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 250.

**Lotteries**

Irish, Law as to.
*Q.* Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 15*, 979.

**Lottery Circulars**

Postal Transmission of, *see under* Post Office.

**Lough, Mr.**—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Islington, W.]

Absence through Illness, Effect of, on Grant, *May 28*, 1476.

Dinas Powis, School, Condition of, *May 28*, 1475.

**Lough Cutra**

Sale Proposals for Lord Gough's Property.
*Q.* Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 372.

**Loughrea**

Earl's Park, Ballinlawless and Tullyhill Grazing Farms, Disturbance at—Arrests made, etc.
*Q.* Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 970.

**Lowe, Sir F. W.** [Birmingham, Edgbaston]

Income Tax, Permanency of, at 1s. in the pound, *May 8*, 261.

**Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.** [Cumberland, Penrith]

Rulings, *see under titles* Questions and Speaker.

**Lunacy**

Scotland—Report of Commissioners, Presented, *May 23*, 1153; *May 28*, 1452.

Visitors, Work of—Report (1906–7) Presented, *May 9*, 335; *May 13*, 535.

**Lundon, Mr. W.** [Limerick, E.]

Grace, Lady, Estate of, Sale Proposals for *May 13*, 579.

Mountshannon Estate — Reinstatement Claims of Evicted Tenants, *May 13*, 579.

**Lupton, Mr. A.** [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]

India—Punjab Disturbances, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with, *May 13*, 615, 619.

London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 434.

Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 513–516.

Zambesi—Victoria Falls, Conditions of Concessions made at, *May 14*, 785.

**Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A.** [St. George's, Hanover Square]
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 690–695.
- Fiscal Policy—Adaptation, Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 13*, 691–695.
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government towards, *May 13*, 694, 695.
- Taxation—Necessity for broadening Basis of, *May 13*, 691.
- Transvaal Chinese Labourers—Circumstances of Admission of Coolies without Licences, *May 15*, 1024, 1026.

**Lytton, Earl of**
- Factory and Workship Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 744–748.

**McCallum, Mr.** [Paisley]
- Kew Gardens, Objections to Sunday Labour in , *May 23*, 1211.

**McCalmont, Col. J.** [Antrim, E.]
- Abbeyleix—Boycotting of Jackson, Dunne, and Draper, Protection afforded by Police, etc., *May 7*, 72, 73.

**McCrae, Mr. G.** [Edinburgh, E.]
- Telegraph Service in Scotland—Underground Wires, Progress made with laying, *May 9*, 421.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1489; *May 29*, 1726.
  - Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1673–1678, 1680, 1683.

**Macdonald, Mr. J. R.** [Leicester]
- Education
  - Board of—Duties, etc., of Medical Officer, *May 16*, 1102.
  - Medical Inspection of Schools, Proposals for, *May 9*, 363.
    - Issue of Memorandum of Suggestions, proposed, *May 16*, 1101.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 822–830.
- Imperial Conference, 1907, Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government towards, *May 14*, 827–829.
- Insurance—Industrial Companies, Complaints against Business Methods of, Inquiry proposed, *May 13*, 638.
- Natal—Visit of Dinuzulu, Allegations as to Disloyalty, etc., *May 29*, 1638.
- Old-age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 14*, 841.
- Taxation, Basis of, Necessity for broadening, *May 14*, 824–830.
- Transvaal Mines—Strike of White Miners, Use of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 27*, 1310.

**Mackarness, Mr. F. C.** [Berks, Newbury]
- Newbury Railway Station, Improvement of, proposed, *May 29*, 1641.
- Orange River Colony, Constitution, Date of granting Letters Patent, *May 15*, 1019.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Unlicensed Coolies
    - Circumstances of Admission of, *May 15*, 1020, 1021.
    - Position of and Measures taken to deal with, *May 13*, 624.
  - Mines—Information as to Strike of White Labourers, *May 13*, 624.
    - Employment of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 27*, 1309; *May 29*, 1636, 1638.

**McKenna, Mr. R.**—*President, Board of Education*
- Code, Date of Circulating, *May 15*, 962.
- Dublin—Progress made with Valuation, *May 27*, 1332.
- Education Board
  - Constitution of—Date of Last Meeting etc., *May 14*, 796, 797.
  - Medical Department, Proposals for, *May 15*, 962.
- Education (Local Authority Default) Act, 1904 — Occasions for putting into Operation, *May 14*, 797.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 665–672; *May 14*, 901.
- Grants from Consolidated Fund or out of Revenue (1901–5), *May 16*, 1101.
- Halifax
  - Copley School, Accommodation in, *May 16*, 1086.
  - Salterhebble School, Reason for Discontinuance of Grant to, *May 29*, 1644, 1645.
- Halsall Charity Scheme, Cause for Delay in preparing, *May 14*, 796.
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Government towards, *May 13*, 669–672.
- Land Purchase, Ireland—Valuation under Section 16 of Finance Act, 1896, Effect of, *May 27*, 1333.
- Llanelian Schoolmaster, Decision as to Payment of Salary of, *May 7*, 70.
- Medical Inspection of Schools, Proposals for, *May 9*, 344, 364.
  - Issue of Memorandum of Suggestions proposed, *May 16*, 1102.
- Medical Officer to the Board, Duties, etc. *May 16*, 1102.
- Merchant Shipping, Effect on, of Change in Fiscal System *May 13*, 670, 671.

[*cont.*

**McKenna, Mr. R.**—*cont.*
- National Debt
  - Capital Borrowings, Amount allocated to Payment of Interest and Annuities, *May 13*, 668, 669.
  - Fixed Debt Charge, Amount allocated to, *May 13*, 668.
- Poor Law Children boarded out in the Country, Payment of Cost of Educating, *May 14*, 795.
- Schools
  - Accommodation, Regulations as to, *May 29*, 1645, 1646.
  - Expenditure by Local Authorities on Provision of since 1870, *May 8*, 202.
  - Nomenclature, New Proposals as to, *May 9*, 365.
  - Secondary
    - Condition of, Lack of Facilities, etc., Necessity for dealing with the Matter, *May 15*, 1052–1056.
    - Grants, Additional, Proposals as to, *May 15*, 1053, 1054.
    - Local Control, Extension of Principle, of to all Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, proposed, *May 15*, 1054–1056.
    - Proposals as to, date of submitting, *May 15*, 962; *May 23*, 1164.
- Skipton Schools, Nomenclature of, *May 9*, 365.
- South Kensington Museum—Late Free Night on Thursdays, proposed, *May 29*, 1646.
- South Kensington Technological College—Incorporation Charter, Proposals for Tabling, *May 7*, 69.
- Taxation—Basis of, Necessity for Broadening, *May 13*, 665, 666; *May 14*, 901.
- Training Colleges—Religious Tests on Admission of Students, Discontinuance of Grant to Colleges, enforcing, proposed, *May 8*, 224; *May 15*, 1055.
- Victoria and Albert Museum, Arrangement and Organisation—Appointment of Advisory Committee, *May 7*, 69.
- Wales and Monmouthshire—Schools which do or do not receive Assistance from the Rates, *May 14*, 798.

**Maclean, Mr. D.** [Bath]
- Bath—Post Office in High Street, Lack of Public Accommodation in, *May 9*, 413.
- Land Legislation for England and Wales—Proposals for dealing with Hardships of Urban Tenants, *May 16*, 1111.
- Post Office Employés, Conditions of Employment, Rate of Pay, etc., *May 9*, 412.
- Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 297.

**MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S.** [Donegal, S.]
- Customs and Excise—Subscriptions collected or promoted by Superior Officers of Customs among Subordinates, Rule as to, *May 15*, 945.
- Donegal, Fishery Rights of Congested Districts, New By-law as to, *May 14*, 777.
- Dublin, Telegraphists performing Overtime on 9th April, Reply to Representations from, *May 14*, 775.
- Government Buildings in Ireland, Use of Irish Materials in constructing, *May 14*, 777.
- Portsmouth Naval Barracks Disturbance—Remission of Remainder of Sentences, proposed, *May 16*, 1079.
- Post Office Savings Bank, Unclaimed Balances, Amount of and Proposals for Utilising, *May 15*, 942.

**MacVeagh, Mr. J.** [Down, S.]
- Land Commissioners, Names and Religion of, *May 13*, 602.
- Local Authorities, Ireland—Power to accept Tenders not the Lowest submitted, *May 9*, 337.
- National School Teachers—Salaries over £70, Reason for paying to certain Teachers, *May 8*, 203.
- Privy Councillors, Ireland, Names of, *May 10*, 468.
- Religious Opinions and Names of Irish Officials, Information as to, *May 10*, 467.

**Macedonia**
- Papers relating to, Date of Tabling.
  - *Os.* Lord Newton, Lord Fitzmaurice, *May 29*, 1608.

**Maddison, Mr. F.** [Burnley]
- Gravesend Water-guard Inspector, Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16*, 1127, 1128.

**Magistrates**
- Ireland
  - Belfast and Dublin, Number in, and Salaries of.
    - *Qs.* Capt. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 27*, 1331, 1332.
  - Kelly, Mr. P. J., Allegations against.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1649.
  - Return as to Previous Occupations proposed.
    - *Q.* Mr. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 10*, 467.
- Scotland—Allegations as to Practice of Adjudicating in Cases where Partners or Joint Agents plead.
  - *Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 15*, 964.

**Magnus, Sir P.** [London University]
- Education
  - Secondary
    - Condition of, Lack of Facilities, etc., Necessity for Dealing with the matter, *May 15*, 1046–1050.
    - Local Control, Extension of Principle of to all Secondary Schools and Training Colleges proposed, *May 15*, 1049, 1058.

**Maidstone Gas Bill**
- *l. Rep.* May 14*, 733.
- 3R.* *May 29*, 1585.

**Mall to Charing Cross**
- Completion, Date for.
  - *Q.* Visc. Turnour; *A.* Mr. Speaker, *May 7*, 70, 71.
- Electric Light Standards for the Mall, Date of Erecting.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *May 7*, 70.

**Mallet, Mr. C. E.** [Plymouth]
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 830–834, 838.
- Fiscal Policy—Colonial Preference, Question of, Advantages Offered by the Colonies, *May 14*, 830–834, 438.
- Naval Dockyard Writers, Effect of New Scheme on Pay and Promotion of, *May 14*, 782.

**Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill**
- *c. Rep.* May 9*, 333.
- *Con.* May 15*, 926.
- 3R.* *May 23*, 1150.
- *l.* Commons Amendts., *con.* May 28*, 1450.

**Mansfield and District Light Railways**
- Order Presented, *May 14*, 734, 768.

**Marine Biological Association**
- Committee, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 13*, 632.

**Marines, Royal**
- Officers, Details of New Scheme for.
  - *Q.* Mr. G. Greenwood; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 7*, 56.
- Report on, Date of Completing and proposals for Tabling.
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 28*, 1468.

**Markham, Mr. A. B.** [Notts, Mansfield]
- Africa, East—Cotton growing, Conditions of Government Assistance to, *May 8*, 215.
- Charity Lands, Sale of—Case of St. Mary's Hospital, Chichester, *May 13*, 575.

**Markham, Mr. A. B.**—*cont.*
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill
  - Committee, Constitution of, Evidence Taken by, and Date of Issuing Report, *May 13*, 574.
  - Proposals as to, *May 8*, 242.
- Motor Omnibuses, Emission of Smoke by—Penalty under Existing Acts, *May 9*, 362.
- Nigeria, Northern—Decision as to Railway, *May 8*, 215.
- Post Office—Lottery Circulars, Rule as to Transmission of, *May 9*, 363.
- Prisons
  - Dietary, Alleged Inadequacy of, *May 23*, 1217.
  - Warders, Encouragement of better class of Men, proposed, *May 23*, 1217.
  - Women Inspectors, Appointment of, proposed, *May 23*, 1217.

**Marriages**
- Legislation to Prevent Marriage of persons with Hereditary Diseases, proposed.
  - *Q.* Capt. Faber; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 8*, 242.

**Marriages Provisional Order Bill**
- *l. Rep.* May 14*, 733.
- *Com.* and *Rep.* May 15*, 921.
- 3R.* *May 16*, 1070.

**Married Women's Property Bill**
- *c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 804.

**Mason, Mr. J. F.** [Windsor]
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Land Court, Limiting Expenses in Respect of, to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1353.

**Matrimonial Causes Acts Amendment Bill**
- *l.* 2R., *May 8*, 199.
- *Com.* and *Rep.* May 14*, 763.

**Mayo**
- County Council Grant, Deduction from in Respect of Land Purchase.
  - *Q.* Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 10*, 464.

**Meagher, Mr. M.** [Kilkenny, N.]
- Ennisnag—Reinstatement Claim of R. Reddy, *May 7*, 73.
- Kilkenny
  - Evictions and Reinstatements, Information as to, *May 13*, 580.
  - Postal Communication with Castlecomer, Improvement of, proposed, *May 7*, 51.
- Post Office, Ireland, Stores in—Selection of Staff for New Branch, *May 7*, 76.

**Meat**
Imported, Inspection of, in Scotland.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 16*, 1104.

**Meath**
County Surveyorship, Procedure in applying for.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 598.

**Medway Conservancy**
Accounts presented, *May 23*, 1153; *May 28*, 1455.

**Merchant Shipping**
[*For* particular Vessels, *see their names.*]
British and German Vessels, Passengers carried to United States by (1904–6.)
*Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 27*, 1322.
Classification of certain Lines.
*Qs.* Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 27*, 1321–1323.
Derelicts at Sea, Danger from and Proposals as to searching for.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 9*, 350, 351.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 9*, 358.
Effect on, of change in Fiscal System.
*Os.* Mr. McKenna, *May 13*, 670, 671; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 670; Mr. Toulmin, *May 14*, 880.
Parliamentary Elections, Disabilities of Seamen, *see under* Parliamentary, Elections.
Statistical Return as to Vessels entering and clearing certain Ports in 1906—Presented, *May 10*, 462.
Steamship Subsidies—Return (1906–7), Ordered, *May 16*, 1079.

**Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill**
*l.* 2R., *May 28*, 1456.

**Merchant Shipping (Tonnage deduction for propelling Power) Bill**
*c.* 2R., *May 24*, 1267.
Counsel, Proposal for hearing at Committee Stage.
*Q.* Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 7*, 52, 53.
Cross-channel Steamers, Exemption of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 7*, 52, 53.
Effect on Powers granted to certain Dock and Harbour Authorities as to levy of dues.
*Q.* Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 961.

**Mersey Docks and Harbour Board Bill**
*c.* Order for Second Reading read and Bill withdrawn, *May 7*, 47.

**Metropolitan Police Provisional Order Bill**
*l. Rep.* May 14*, 733.
*Com.* and Rep.* May 15*, 921.
3R.* *May 16*, 1070.

**Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 7*, 48.
2R.* *May 23*, 1150.

**Metropolitan Water Board**
Officials transferred, Conditions imposed on.
*Q.* Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 15*, 943.

**Mevoo**
Grazing Land, Purchase Proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 599, 600.

**Middlesbrough Corporation Bill**
*c. Rep.* May 9*, 333.
*Con.* May 27*, 1294.

**Middlesex**
Hornsey Division—New Writ issued, *May 29*, 1608.

**Midland Railway Bill**
*l.* Report from Select Committee, *May 13*, 533.
3R.* *May 28*, 1449.
*c.* 1R.* *May 29*, 1611.

**Midleton, Viscount**
Sat first in Parliament after the Death of his Father, *May 16*, 1069.

**Mildmay, Mr. F. B.** [Devon, Totnes]
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1399–1406.

**Military Training in Schools**
Compulsory Training in Secondary Schools, Proposals as to Grant for.
*Q.* Mr. Bright; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 9*, 352.

**Militia**
Artillery
Garrison—saving effected on Ammunition used for Training.
*Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 7*, 58.
Mounted Training for Officers and Rank and File, Facilities for.
*Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 610, 611.
Caps and Putties of new Pattern, Cause for delay in issue of.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 606.

[*cont.*

**Militia**—*cont.*

Reorganisation Proposals, Postponement of, proposed.
*Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 610.

Special Contingent, Inducements to join.
*Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* mr. Haldane, *May 10*, 1089.

**Milk**

Municipal Depots, Receipts from and Cost of Working.
*Q.* Mr. Ridsdale; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 23*, 54.

**Mines**

Cumberland Mines under the Sea, Leases for—Return Ordered, *May 16*, 1078, Presented, *May 28*, 1462.

Inspectors, Names and previous Occupations of—Return Presented, *May 16*, 1077.

Report and Statistics (1906), Presented, *May 9*, 334; *May 13*, 534.

**Mint**

Appropriation-in-aid, Explanation of,
*Os.* Mr. Morton, Mr. Runciman, *May 16*, 1118, 1119.

Gold Coinage, Reason for increased Loss on.
*Os.* Mr. C. Hay, *May 16*, 1117; Mr. Runciman, 1118.

Hours of Labour of Officials
*Os.* Mr. Morton, *May 16*, 1118, 1119; Mr. Runciman, 1119.

Police, Charge for.
*Os.* Sir F. Banbury, Mr. Runciman, *May 16*, 1117.

Silver Coinage, Loss on, Allowance to Bullion Brokers, etc.
*Os.* Mr. L. Jones, *May 16*, 1118; Mr. Runciman, 1119.

Vote for, *May 16*, 1117.

Wages, Salaries and Allowances, Increase in Estimate for.
*Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *May 16*, 1117; Mr. Runciman, 1117.

**Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill**

*l.* 3R.* *May 8*, 198.
*c.* Lords Amendts., *Con.** *May 16*, 1075.

**Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W.** [Lanark, N.W.]

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 865–869.

Fiscal Policy, Adaptation of, to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 14*, 865–869.

Imports from Colonies and British Possessions in 1905, *May 13*, 628.

Irish Council Bill, Proposals as to, *May 27*, 1334.

**Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W.**—*cont.*

Navy

" Indefatigable " and " Scylla," Speed of, *May 13*, 575.

Manœuvres, Decision as to, *May 13*, 575.

St. Lucia, Riots, Information as to, *May 8*, 216.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill

Agricultural Commissioners, Limiting Expenses in connection with to £3,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1344–1346.

Land Court, Limiting Expenses in Respect of to £6,000 per annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1353.

Taxation, Basis of, Necessity for Broadening, *May 14*, 866–869.

Telegraph Service in Scotland—Underground Wires, Progress made with Laying, *May 9*, 423.

West Indies

British Naval Vessels for Service in—Decision as to Additional Cruiser, *May 8*, 217.

Mail Service Subsidy, Proposals as to, *May 9*, 424.

**Mond, Mr. A.** [Chester]

Cattle, Importation Restrictions on Canadian Cattle, Removal of, proposed, *May 28*, 1465.

Customs and Excise—Cost of Customs Collection on Preferential Basis for certain Goods, *May 28*, 1472.

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 859–865.

Fiscal Policy, Adaptation of, to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 14*, 859–865.

**Money, Mr. L. G. Chiozza** [Paddington, N.]

Canada—Customs Duty on Produce of United Kingdom, Alterations in since 1897, *May 13*, 629.

Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 805–813.

Fiscal Policy

Colonial Preference, Question of Advantages offered by the Colonies, *May 14*, 805–815.

Manufactured Goods, 10 per cent. Tax on, *May 14*, 812, 813.

Income Tax, Graduation of, Necessity for, *May 14*, 816, 817.

London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 439–441.

Metropolitan District Company, Workmen's Fares charged by, *May 13*, 635.

Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 500.

[*cont.*

**Money, Mr. L. G. Chiozza** *cont.*
- Paddington
  - Borough Council, Refusal to take Proceedings against certain Traders, Explanation of, *May 9*, 357.
  - West London Central Church, Rating of, *May 9*, 361.
- Privilege Cab System, Progress of Negotiations as to, *May 9*, 357.
- Taxation, Basis of, Necessity for Broadening, *May 14*, 813–818.
- Wealth, Distribution of, *May 13*, 815, 816, 817.

**Monkswell, Lord**
- Soldiers, Civil Employment for on Discharge
  - Circular Issued by War Office, Results of—Issuing Papers Relating to, proposed, *May 29*, 1599, 1602, 1603.
  - Trades, Teaching of, while in the Army, Steps taken to carry out Recommendations of Committee, *May 29*, 1599–1603, 1607.

**Mooney, Mr. J. J.** [Newry]
- Condition of Ireland—Facilities for Parliamentary Discussion, etc., *May 15*, 980.

**Moore, Mr. W.** [Armagh, N.]
- Abbeyleix—Boycotting of Jackson, Dunne, and Draper—Protection afforded by Police, etc., *May 7*, 73.
- Ballymoney—Inquiry into Carnfinton Cottages Scheme, proposed, *May 15*, 975.
- Education, Intermediate—Programme for 1908, Working of and Date of Publication, *May 8*, 232.
- Grazing Farms under Police Protection, *May 15*, 973.
- Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 130–144
  - Course followed in Printing, *May 29*, 1656.
- Land Purchase—Intimidation exercised in Surrender of Grazing Farms, *May 14*, 800.
- Lincolnshire, Crime in—Condition of Brigg Division, *May 8*, 220.
- Parliamentary Procedure—Proposals for dealing with Blocking Motions, *May 15*, 982.

**Moray Firth**
- Trawling in
  - British Subjects in Subordinate Positions on Foreign Vessels, Reason for Prosecution of.
    - *Qs.* Sir G. Doughty, Mr. A. S. Wilson; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *May 8*, 243, 244.
  - Foreign Vessels reported and Number with British Crews.
    - *Qs.* Mr. A. S. Wilson, Sir G. Doughty; *As.* Mr. Sinlair, *May 8*, 225.

**Morgan, Mr. G. H.** [Cornwall, Truro]
- Supply of Electricity Bill—Reintroduction, Proposals as to, *May 13*, 637.
- Truro–Helston—Alleged Evasion of Land Tax Commissioners Act, *May 16*, 1099.

**Morgan, Mr. J. L.** [Carmarthen, W.]
- Railways—Passengers' Luggage, Regulations as to Insurance of, *May 9*, 359, 360.

**Morley, Rt. Hon. J.**—*Secretary of State for India* [Montrose Burghs]
- Amritsar—Number of Licences issued for Sale of Spirits, *May 14*, 772.
- Army
  - Expenditure in 1870, 1880, 1890, 1900 and 1906, *May 29*, 1623.
  - Officers on Leave in England—Rule as to Drawing Pay, *May 15*, 947.
- Arrests and Imprisonment without Trial during last Eighty-nine Years, *May 15*, 949.
- Assam—Trade Route *via* Rima into China, Proposals for Opening up, *May 15*, 930.
- Bengal, Eastern—Disturbances in Mymensingh District, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with, *May 8*, 209, 210.
- Bombay
  - City Native Police, Proposals for Improving Conditions of Service of, *May 23*, 1160.
  - Political Service, Pay of Military Officers in, *May 29*, 1627.
- Budget
  - Explanatory Memorandum—Place and Date of Preparation, *May 15*, 929.
  - Statement, Date of Presenting, *May 15*, 929.
- Cantonment Act, 1899, Amendment of, proposed, *May 29*, 1629.
- Cantonment Magistrates, Duties and Powers of, *May 29*, 1630.
- Darjeeling—Government Aid to St. Paul's School, *May 27*, 1313.
- Factory Labour, Conditions of—Result of Inquiry, *May 28*, 1465.
- Flogging as Judicial Punishment—Reply to Dispatch, *May 27*, 1312.
- German Colonial Legislative Proposals as to British Indians, *May 29*, 1631.
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Circumstances of Attendance of Sir J. Mackay, Authority for Statements on Preference, etc., *May 8*, 210, 211.
- Irrigation, Net Revenue from, in 1881–2, 1901–2, and 1906–7, *May 29*, 1626.
- Land Revenue in 1856, 1895 and 1905, *May 29*, 1622.
- Moral and Material Progress—Date of presenting Statement, *May 15*, 929.

[*cont.*

**Morley, Rt. Hon. J.**—*cont.*
- Opium, Calcutta Sales, Price at, *May 27*, 1300.
- Plague, Deaths from in April and since 1896, *May 15*, 949.
- Police—Decision as to Period for Retirement, *May 13*, 593.
- Punjab
  - Lahore Riots, Cause of—Arrests made, etc., *May 13*, 577 ; *May 15*, 949, 950.
    - Lalu Lajpat Rai, Circumstances of Arrest of, *May 29*, 1633, 1634.
  - Land Colonisation Bill, Tabling Copy of, proposed, *May 29*, 1630.
  - Land Revenue System, Effect of, *May 13*, 577 ; *May 15*, 928.
  - Rawal Pindi
    - Land Revenue in 1861, 1881 and 1901 ; *May 29*, 1624.
    - Land Tax and Irrigation, Cess Charges under, *May 29*, 1632.
    - Riots, Cause of, *May 29*, 1633.
  - Unrest in, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with—Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion, etc., *May 13*, 612–618 ; *May 14*, 784.
- Railways
  - Bombay-Sind Line—Correspondence and Memorial as to Cutch Route, *May 29*, 1630, 1631.
  - Rolling Stock, Suggestion for obviating Inadequacy of, *May 9*, 345.
- State Prisoners, Regulations governing Confinement of, *May 13*, 612.

**Morley Estate**
- Purchase Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 976.

**Morocco**
- Condition of and Measures taken to protect British Subjects.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 954.
- Disturbances, Information as to.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley ; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *May 9*, 356.

**Morpeth, Viscount** [Birmingham, S.]
- Army Reservists, Special, Pay, etc., of, *May 15*, 948.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1489, 1513-1516.

**Morton, Mr. A. C.** [Sutherland]
- Congested Districts Board Report, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1103.

**Morton, Mr. A. C.**—*cont.*
- Durness, Steamboat Service with Thurso, proposed, *May 28*, 1477.
- Embo Pier, Proposals for Improving, *May 28*, 1477.
- Education—Date of Presenting Scottish Reports, *May 16*, 1102.
- Exchequer and Audit Department—Hours of Labour of Officials, *May 16*, 1116.
- Fisheries—Report of Scottish Board, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1103.
- Government Property
  - Rates on
    - Apartments provided in Royal Palaces, Reason for defraying Rates out of Public Funds, *May 16*, 1113, 1114.
    - Assessment, Method adopted for, *May 16*, 1113.
    - Houses occupied by Foreign Representatives, Amount paid on, *May 16*, 1113, 1116.
- Gravesend Water-guard Inspector, Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16*, 1125, 1130–1132.
- Income-Tax
  - Earned Income of over £2,000 divided into Small Incomes, Assessment of, *May 13*, 631.
  - Poor Rates, Copies of—Cost of Providing for Income-Tax purposes, *May 16*, 1143.
- Local Government Report, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1103.
- Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1270.
- Mint
  - Appropriation-in-aid, Explanation of *May 16*, 1118.
  - Hours of Labour of Officials, *May 16*, 1118, 1119.
- Post Office
  - Carmen, Increase in Wages of, and Provision of Uniform for, *May 9*, 407, 415.
  - Foreign Postal Rates, Anomalies of, *May 9*, 407.
  - Letters, Deliveries in Remote Parts, Increase in Number of, *May 9*, 409, 410.
  - Permanent Officials, Criticisms on Policy of, *May 9*, 408.
- Scottish Crofters Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1103.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Expenditure by Authorities set up by the Bill, Provisions as to, *May 24*, 1250–1252.

[*cont.*

**Morton, Mr. A. C.**—*cont.*
Telegraph Service
Race Meetings, Expenditure due to, *May 9*, 409.
Rural Districts, Increasing Facilities in, proposed, *May 9*, 409.
Scotland—Underground Wires, Progress made with laying, *May 9*, 408, 409, 417.
Trawlers Regulation Bill, Facilities for Passage of, *May 13*, 633.

**Motors**
Accidents during last Six Months.
*Qs.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 27*, 1318, 1319.
Increased Taxation of, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Bottomley, *May 13*, 688.
Iveagh—Pirrie Scheme, *see under* Ireland.
Omnibuses, Emission of Smoke by—Penalty under Existing Acts.
*Qs.* Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. Burns, *May 9*, 362.
Speed Tests on Public Roads, Police Powers of Regulating—Frome's Hill Case, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Burns, *May 27*, 1323, 1324.

**Mountshannon Estate**
Reinstatement Claims of Evicted Tenants.
*Q.* Mr. Lundon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 579, 580.
Untenanted Lands—Scheme for Distributing.
*Q.* Mr. O. Shaughnessy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 16*, 1080.

**Mucklon**
Hughes' Holding—Cost of Police Protection on 7th instant.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 974, 975.

**Municipal Elections Bill**
c. 2R.* *May 27*, 1448.

**Municipal Representation Bill**
Select Committee, Appointment of certain Lords.
*Os.* Lord Avebury, *May 14*, 763, 764; Marquess of Lansdowne, Marquess of Ripon, 763.

**Murphy, Mr. J.** [Kerry, E.]
Education
National School Teacher's Civil Rights—Decision as to Modification of Rules, *May 13*, 581.
Primary Application of Portion of Budget Surplus to, proposed, *May 7*, 75.

**Muskerry, Lord**
Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill, 2R., *May 28*, 1457.
Parliamentary Elections—Seamen's Disabilities, Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 13*, 537–541, 545.

**Muslins**
Exports to Germany, reimported after finishing—Extent of Trade.
*Q.* Colonel Harrison-Broadley; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 23*, 1163, 1164.

**Myer, Mr. H.** [Lambeth, N.]
Income-Tax on Earned Incomes—Shares in Limited Companies taken as Part Earnings, Position of, *May 8*, 262.
Post Office—Sanitary Condition of London Offices, Inquiry into Proposals for Presenting Report, *May 15*, 932.

**Natal**
British-Indians, Trading Licences of—Complaints as to Administration of Law.
*Qs.* Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 619, 620.
Dinuzulu, Visit of—Interviews with Governor and Allegations as to Charges of Disloyalty.
*Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1638, 1639.
Gumede, Mr. J. Cause for Arrest of.
*Q.* Mr. Pickersgill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 16*, 1096, 1097.
Veal, Mr., Circumstances of Murder of—Arrests made, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1314, 1315.

**National Debt**
Annuities—Accounts (1906–1907), Presented, *May 29*, 1585, 1612.
Capital Borrowings, Amount allocated to Payment of Interest and Annuities
*Os.* Mr. McKenna, *May 13*, 668, 669; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 668.
Fixed Debt Charge, Amount allocated to.
*Os.* Mr. McKenna, *May 13*, 668.
Sinking Funds—Accounts (1906–7), Presented, *May 15*, 927.

**National Debt Office**
Salaries, Explanation of Increased Estimate for.
*Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *May 16*, 1119, 1120; Mr. Runciman, 1120; Mr. Watt, 1120.
Vote for, *May 16*, 1120.

**National Gallery, Ireland**
Report Presented, *May 28*, 1453, 1462.

**National Physical Laboratory**
Inquiry, Constitution of Committee.
*Q.* Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 8*, 206.

**National Portrait Gallery**
Report of Trustees (1906–7), Presented *May 27*, 1295; *May 28*, 1453.

**Naturalisation**
*See under* Aliens.

**Navy**
*First Lord*—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
*Financial Secretary*—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.
"Ariel," Loss of—Proposals for Inquiry.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 9*, 343.
Australasian Squadron—Understanding arrived at in Conference as to Colonial Contribution, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. J. C. Wason, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 13*, 603.
Battleships (*see subheadings names of Ships*).
Boys, Training of—Hours Spent at Sea by "Magnificent" and "Victorious."
*Q.* Mr. Beauchamp; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 16*, 1092.
Candidates—Order as to Repayment of Expenses for Subsistence, Presented, *May 28*, 1454, 1463.
Deptford Victualling Yard, Hours of Labour and Holidays at—Proposals as to Admiralty Visit, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Bowerman; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 15*, 931, 932.
Dock Book—Date of last Edition, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 28*, 1463.
Dockyards (*see also subheadings names of Dockyards*).
Assessment of, Method adopted.
*Os.* Mr. Bellairs, *May 16*, 1114, 1115; Mr. Runciman, 1115.
Writers, Effect of New Scheme on Pay and Promotion of.
*Qs.* Mr. Bramsdon, Mr. Mallet; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 14*, 782.
*Qs.* Mr. E. H. Lamb; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 16*, 1083, 1084.
Engineers
Assistants entering for Temporary Service, Circular supplied to.
*Q.* Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr E. Robertson, *May 28*, 1463, 1464.
Inquiry—Decision as to Publishing Reports.
*Q.* Mr. B. Law; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 23*, 1158, 1159.

**Navy**—*cont.*
Foreign Navies, Number of British Seamen joining, Conditions of Service in Royal Fleet Reserve.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 9*, 338.
Gunnery Practice, Regulations as to carrying out in fine weather only.
*Q.* Mr. Partington; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 27*, 1305, 1306.
"Indefatigable" and "Scylla," speed of.
*Q.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 13*, 575.
Lyddite Shell, Tenders for—Allocation of Contracts at Woolwich, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 13*, 603, 604.
Manœuvres, Decision as to.
*Q.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 13*, 575.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 28*, 1467, 1468.
Marines, Royal, *see that title.*
"Mars" and "Hannibal"—Source of Supply of Men to complete Crews.
*Qs.* Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 15*, 930.
Midshipmen, Payment by, for Instruction.
*Q.* Mr. Brooke; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 27*, 1305.
Nucleus Crews, Night Training at Sea, Information as to.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *N.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 7*, 55.
Obsolete Vessels
Conditions of Sale of and Proposals for utilising.
*Qs.* Mr. Watt, Mr. R. Duncan, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 9*, 349–350.
Value of Certain Vessels if sold without Condition as to breaking up.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 14*, 781, 782.
Vessels in the Holy Loch, Original Cost of and Price obtained for.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 8*, 207.
Officers on Half Pay—Order as to Repayment of Cost of forwarding Baggage, Presenting, *May 28*, 1454, 1463.
Pensions—Case of G. Day.
*Q.* Mr. W. Benn; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 16*, 1083.
Portsmouth Dockyards
Chargemen of Labourers, Wages of.
*Q.* Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 8*, 204.
Date of Admiralty Visit to.
*Q.* Mr. Bramsden; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 29*, 1621.

[*cont.*

**Navy**—*cont.*

Portsmouth Naval Barracks Disturbance—Remission of Remainder of Sentences proposed.
*Q.* Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 16,* 1079.

Portsmouth Naval Gunnery Training Establishment Staff, Proposals for reducing.
*Q.* Mr. Stanger; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 27,* 1306.

Rosyth

Price paid for—Names of Valuators, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. A. Cross, Mr. Watt, Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, Mr. Speaker, *May 7,* 56, 57.

Value of surrounding Land, Effect of Establishment of Dockyard on.
*Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 9,* 351.

Sailors' Kits, Free Grant of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Brooke; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 27,* 1305.

Savings Bank—Accounts (1905-6) Presented, *May 16,* 1070, 1078.

Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Armament of.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 27,* 1306.

Torpedo Boat Flotilla at Sheerness and Chatham, Information as to.
*Q.* Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 15,* 930.

Torpedoes—Number manufactured in 1907 and Allocation of Contracts.
*Qs.* Mr. Scarisbrick, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 16,* 1092.

**Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynamman Railway Bill**

*l.* 2R.* *May 8,* 198.

**New Forest**

Poor Law Guardians, Relief granted by—Decision of Mr. Locke, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Bennett; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 28,* 1467.

**New Hebrides**

Female Labour under Age

Estimate of Number Available for Employment.
*Q.* Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8,* 217.

Restrictions on Recruitment of.
*Qs.* Major Anstruther-Gray, Sir G. Parker, Lord Balcarres, Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. Mr. Churchill, *May 14,* 785, 786.

**New South Wales**

Unimproved Land Value, Legislative Proposals for Rating.
*Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 14,* 800, 801.

**Newbury**

Railway Station Platform, Width of and Proposals for Improvement.
*Q.* Mr. Mackarness; *A* .Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 29,* 1641, 1642.

**Newman Estate**

Reinstatement Claim of T. O'Callaghan.
*Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15,* 938.

**Newmarket-on-Fergus**

Outrage at House of Caretaker Boland.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale: *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15,* 967.

**Newquay and District Water Bill**

*c. Rep.* May 14,* 765.
*Con.* May 23,* 1150.
3R.* *May 27,* 1294.
*l.* Commons Amendts., *Con.* May 29,* 1585.

**Newton, Lord**

House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 7,* 42.

Macedonia, Date of Tabling Papers relating to, *May 29,* 1608.

**Nicholls, Mr. G.** [Northants, N.]

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27,* 1406, 1415–1419.

**Nicholson, Mr. C. N.** [Yorks, W.R., Doncaster]

Kingston-upon-Hull, Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13,* 711.

West Ham Workhouse and Infirmary—Cost of Alcoholic Liquors consumed (1905–7), *May 13,* 585.

**Nicholson, Mr. W.** [Hants, Petersfield]

Alton Military Hospital, Use of, *May 15,* 948.

**Neild, Mr. H.** [Middlesex, Ealing]

Ealing Postal Facilities, Necessity for Improvement in, *May 9,* 425.

Hague Conference—Mining Operations in Territorial Waters, Discussion of, proposed, *May 13,* 601.

Money-lenders, Compelling Insertion of Names and Addresses on Envelopes used by, *May 9,* 426.

National Physical Laboratory Inquiry. Constitution of Committee, *May 8,* 206.

Navy

"Mars" and "Hannibal"—Source of Supply of Men to complete Crews, *May 15,* 930.

Torpedo Boat Flotilla at Sheerness and Chatham, Information as to, *May 15,* 930.

**Nigeria**
Indians from the Punjab, Appointments resigned by, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1314.

Northern—Decision as to Railway.
*Q.* Mr. Markham; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8*, 215.

Railways Material—Procedure in placing Orders for Freight.
*Qs.* Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 9*, 354.

**Nolan, Mr. J.** [Louth, S.]
Congo Free State—Belgian Administration Charges of Ill-Treatment of Natives—Responsibility of Great Britain, etc., *May 15*, 1001–1005.

**North British Railway Bill**
*l.* Report from Select Committee, *May 13*, 533.
3R.* *May 28*, 1449.
*c.* 1R.* *May 29*, 1610.

**North-East London Railway Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 13*, 533.
*Rep.** *May 14*, 733.
3R.* *May 16*, 1069.

**Notification of Births Bill**
*c.* 2R.* *May 8*, 332.

**Nussey, Mr. T. W.** [Pontefract]
Pontefract, Secondary School Site, Conditions of Offer of, *May 9*, 366.

**O'Brien, Mr. H. E.** [Tipperary, Mid.]
Loan Capital Duty claimed from District Councils Non-Assessment of, proposed, *May 15*, 936.

**O'Connor, Mr. Jas.** [Wicklow, W.]
Fitzwilliam Estate—Case of T. Whelan of Aghowle, *May 8*, 237.

Postmasterships—System of advertising Vacancies, *May 9*, 338.

Shillelagh Magistracy, Catholic Representation on and Allegations as to uncertain Attendance, *May 8*, 236.

Superannuation—Regulations for Payment of Pensions during Residence Abroad, *May 29*, 1621.

Westley Estate, Sale Proposals for, *May 27*, 1304.

**O'Connor, Mr. John** [Kildare, N.]
Grazing Farms under Police Protection, *May 15*, 974.

**O'Connor, Mr. T. P.** [Liverpool, Scotland]
Newspaper Postal Rates, Anomalies of, *May 9*, 419–421.

**O'Doherty, Mr. P.** [Donegal, N.]
Carndonagh, Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 8*, 241.

Solicitor's Licence Duty, Abolition of, proposed, *May 15*, 932.

**O'Donnell, Mr. C. T.** [Newington, Walworth]
India
- Army Expenditure in 1870, 1880, 1890, 1900, and 1906, *May 29*, 1623.
- Condition of—Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion, *May 15*, 980, 981.
- Irrigation, Net Revenue from 1881–2, 1901–2, and 1906–7, *May 29*, 1625.
- Land Revenue in 1856, 1875, 1895 and 1905, *May 29*, 1621.
- Punjab
  - Lahore Riot, Cause of—Arrests made, etc., *May 13*, 577.
  - Lalu Lajpat Rai, Circumstances of Arrest of, *May 29*, 1634.
  - Land Revenue System, Effect of, *May 13*, 577, *May 15*, 928; *May 16*, 1096.
  - Rawal Pindi
    - Land Revenue in 1861, 1881, and 1901; *May 29*, 1624.
    - Land Tax and Irrigation, Cess Charges under, *May 29*, 1632.

**O'Donnell, Mr. T.** [Kerry, W.]
Dingle
- Fair Rent Cases and Arrangements for Hearing, *May 9*, 341.
- Harbour Improvements—Loan of Dredger proposed, *May 8*, 228.

Irish Council Bill—Eight Departments proposed to be Dealt with, Annual Income of, etc., *May 15*, 933.

Local Government Electors in each Irish Parliamentary Constituency, *May 14*, 776.

Tralee Constabulary Barracks, Telephone Extension to, proposed, *May 15*, 939.

**O'Grady, Mr. J.** [Leeds, E.]
India
- Punjab Disturbances, Information as to and Measures Taken to Deal with, *May 13*, 612, 614, *May 14*, 784.
- Lahore Riots, Information as to, *May 15*, 949, 950.
- State Prisoners, Regulations Governing Confinement of, *May 13*, 612.

Post Office
- Carmen, Increase in Wages of, and Provision of Uniform for, *May 9*, 406.

[*cont.*

**O'Grady, Mr. J.**—*cont.*
Post Office—*cont.*
Letter Carriers, Rate of Wages Paid to, *May 9*, 405.
Mount Pleasant Joinery Department, Conditions of Employment at, *May 9*, 406.
Public Service Board to Deal with all Questions Relating to, Establishment of, proposed, *May 9*, 406.
Seniority, Loss of—Possibility of Recovering by Subsequent Good Service, *May 14*, 794.

**O'Mara, Mr. J.** [Kilkenny, S.]
Irish Council Bill—Electoral Divisions, Basis for Distributing, *May 15*, 933.

**O'Rorke Estate**
Sale proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 595.

**O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J.** [Limerick, W.]
Army—Inquiry into Case of M. Nealon, proposed, *May 15*, 947.
Mountshannon Estate Untenanted Lands, Disposal of, *May 16*, 1080.

**Oban**
Post Office, Provision of Site for.
*Q.* Mr. Younger; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 29*, 1643.

**Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill**
*l.* 3R.* *May 8*, 198.
*c.* 1R.* *May 13*, 568.

**Old Age Pensions**
Government proposals as to.
*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 657, 658; Mr. Barnes, 678–683; Mr. Bottomley, 685–690; Sir E. Sassoon, 701; Mr. Lane-Fox, *May 14*, 821; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 822, 823; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 841; Mr. Bridgeman, 857; Mr. Harwood, 889; Mr. B. Law, 895, 896.
Sum Required to Provide 5s. per week to all Persons over sixty-five.
*Os.* Mr. Bottomley, *May 13*, 685, 686.

**Old Age Pensions Bill**
*c.* 2R., *May 10*, 470.

*Debate on Second Reading* [Commons] *May 10*, 470.
Contributory Scheme, proposed, 490, 491, 497, 521.
Cost of Providing 5s. per week to all Persons over Sixty-five, 475, 485, 496, 513, 526, 527, 528.
Friendly and Provident Societies, Work of, 492, 493, 523.

**Old Age Pensions Bill**—*cont.*
*Debate on Second Reading—cont.*
Funds for
Graduated Income-tax, Provision of by Means of, proposed, 476, 484.
Protective Tax on Foreign Foodstuffs, proposed, 485, 507.
German System of Compulsory Insurance, Working of, 491, 502, 522.
Government Attitude towards the Measure, 471, 484, 516, 523, 525, 529.
Graduation, Proposals as to, 470, 471.
New Zealand, Working of Schemes in, 478, 488.
Out-door Relief, Increase of Grants and Removal of Disabilities, proposed, 514, 515.
Personal Application to be Made each Week, proposed, 474, 483.
Poor Law Expenditure, Probable Effect on, 486–488, 499, 528.
Public Opinion as to Necessity for Provision of Pensions by the State, etc., 471, 447–483, 489, 501, 503–508, 512, 513, 518–520, 524.
Universal Pension at Age of Sixty-five, proposals as to, 489, 490, 501, 509, 525.
Unworkable Character of the Bill, 483–494.

**Old Hill, Staffs**
Post Office at, Condition of, Arrangements as to Inspection, etc.
*Os.* Mr. Staveley-Hill, *May 9*, 406, 407.

**Onslow, Earl of**
Companies Bill, *Rev.*, *May 14*, 760.

**Opium**
Anti-opium Movement in China, Progress made with.
*Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1316.
Chinese proposals for Restricting Traffic—Memorial from Shanghai Traders, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1639, 1640.
Cure Tried in Federated Malay States, Value of.
*Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1315.
Good Health and Immunity from Fever Conferred by Moderate Use of—Allegation in Report of Central Africa Commissioner.
*Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 23*, 1163.

[*cont.*

**Opium**—*cont.*
Indian
Calcutta Sales, Price at.
*Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 27*, 1300.
Trade with China—Reply to Chinese proposals, etc.
*Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1316.

**Orange River Colony**
Constitution, Date of Granting Letters Patent.
*Os.* Mr. Mackarness, *May 15*, 1019; Mr. Churchill, 1024.

**Oranmore and Browne, Lord**
Irish Tobacco Bill, 2R., *May 7*, 45.

**Ordnance Survey**
Conveyance of Employees, Arrangements for.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 7*, 54.

**Oregon Mortgage Company, Limited, Order Confirmation Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 765.
*Con.** *May 23*, 1150.
3R.* *May 27*, 1294.
*l.* 1 and 2R.* *May 28*, 1450.

**Ormathwaite Estate**
Reinstatement Claim of T. Walsh
*Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 771.

**Paddington**
Borough Council Refusal to take Proceeding against Certain Traders, Explanation of.
*Q.* Mr. C. Money; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 9*, 357.
West London Central Church, Rating of.
*Q.* Mr. C. Money; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 9*, 361.

**Panama Canal**
British Emigrants Employed—Rate of Sickness, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. J. Ward, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 955, 956.
Labourers from British Possessions, Records Kept and Measures for Protection of.
*Q.* Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 619.
Trinidad Labourers, Conditions of Employing.
*Q.* Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 7*, 60.

**Parker, Mr. J.** [Halifax]
Rural Districts, Depopulation of—Causes, Statistics and Necessity for Dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 314.
Small Holdings Act of 1892, Failure of, *May 8*, 318.

**Parker, Sir G.** [Gravesend]
Australasian Naval Squadron—Understanding as to Colonial Contribution, etc., arrived at in Conference, *May 13*, 603.
Canadian Customs Duty on Produce of United Kingdom, Alterations in since 1897, *May 13*, 630.
Crown Agents for the Colonies—Advantages of, Retention *May 9*, 353.
Edalji Case—Compensation, Decision as to, *May 28*, 1473.
Gravesend Water-Guard Inspector, Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16*, 1120–1122, 1123, 1125.
Imperial Conference, 1907
Australasian Naval Squadron, Understanding as to, *May 13*, 603.
*Précis* of Proceedings, Publication of and Responsibility for making, *May 13*, 621.
New Hebrides—Female and Child Labour, Restrictions on Recruitment of, *May 14*, 786.
Post Office
Postage on Newspapers to Canada, Reduction in, *May 9*, 398.
Public Service Board to deal with all Questions relating to, proposed, *May 9*, 399.
Typists, Women, Increase in Salaries of proposed, *May 9*, 398.
Telephone Charges, Excessive Nature of, *May 9*, 400.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1486, 1492, 1525–1528.
Transvaal—Distress in Rural Districts, Allegations as to and Proposals for dealing with, *May 13*, 623.
Zambesi—Victoria Falls, Conditions of Concessions made at, *May 14*, 785.

**Parliament**
House of Commons
Committees, *see that title.*
House of Lords
Fee Fund—Accounts Presented, *May 23*, 1153.
Journal Committee (Vol. 138) Report Presented, *May 8*, 198.
Reform Proposals—Government Attitude towards Select Committee of Inquiry.
*Os.* Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 13*, 535; Marquess of Ripon, 536, 537; Earl of Camperdown, 537.
Sat First
Goschen, Viscount, after the Death of his Father, *May 15*, 921.

Parliament—*cont.*
House of Lords—*cont.*
Sat First—*cont.*
Liverpool, Earl of, after the Death of his Father, *May 14,* 733.
Midleton, Viscount, after the Death of his Father, *May 16,* 1069.
Took the Oath—Lord Howard de Walden, *May 13,* 533.

**Parliamentary Elections**
New Members Sworn
Chaplin, H., for Surrey (Wimbledon) *May 28,* 1478.
Harris, F. L., for Tower Hamlets (Stepney), *May 13,* 646.
New Writs Issued
Middlesex (Hornsey Division), *May 29* 1608.
Rutland, County of, *May 29,* 1608.
Returning Officers' Fees, Legislative Proposals for dealing with.
*Qs.* Viscount Turnour; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *May 16,* 1111.
Seamen's Disabilities, Removal of—Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed.
*Os.* Lord Muskerry, *May 13,* 537–541, 545; Earl of Granard, 541; Lord Ellenborough, 542–544; Marquess of Lansdowne, 544; Marquess of Ripon, 545.

**Parliamentary Procedure**
Dinner Hour, reverting to System of, proposed.
*Os.* Lord Balcarres, *May 15,* 1035, 1036.
Session, Duration of, Proposals as to.
*Os.* Mr. J. Ward, *May 15,* 1028–1030; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 1032–1034; Lord Balcarres, 1036, 1037.
*Q.* Mr. S. Evans; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 15,* 982.

**Partington, Mr. O.** [Derbyshire, High Peak]
Naval Gunnery Practice, Regulations as to carrying out in Fine Weather only, *May 27,* 1305.
Small Holdings, Advantages of Co-operation in connection with, *May 23,* 1183.

**Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill**
*l.* 1R.* *May 13,* 533.
2R.* *May 15,* 921.

**Patents, Designs and Trade Marks**
Report (1906) Presented, *May 27,* 1295; *May 28,* 1455.

**Pearson, Mr. W. H. M.** [Suffolk, Eye]
Imperial Conference, 1907, Control over Delegates to—Political Meeting addressed by Dr. Smartt, *May 16,* 1111.

**Pease, Mr. P.** [Darlington]
Africa, East—Nairobi Prison, Cost of and Date of Completion, *May 7,* 61.
Canada
Customs Duty on Produce of United Kingdom, Alterations in since 1897, *May 13,* 576, 629.
Tariff Arrangements with certain Foreign Countries—Effect on British Trade, *May 23,* 1154.
Cocoa Duties, Anomalies in and Proposals for Revision, *May 24,* 1232.
Congo Free State
Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives, Responsibility of Great Britain, etc., *May 15,* 998.
Belgian Annexation, Official Information as to Proposals for, *May 13,* 627.
British Consular Staff in Upper Congo, Means of Communication possessed by, *May 29,* 1640.
British Subjects residing in, *May 29* 1640.
Edalji Case—Report of Committee, Proposals for Tabling, *May 13,* 634.
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14,* 886–888.
First Offenders, Necessity for differentiating Prison Treatment of, *May 23,* 1216.
Fiscal Policy—Industries of the Country, Effect of Free Trade System on, *May 14,* 887.
Food and Drink
Present System, Amount of Taxation under, *May 14,* 886, 887.
Taxes on, during 1906–7, *May 28,* 1472.
Germany, Trade with, in 1904 and 1905, *May 24,* 1234.
Hague Conference—Proposals for Discussion and Date of Meeting, *May 28,* 1470.
Imperial Conference, 1907
Chancellor of the Exchequer, Address by—Method of obtaining, Figures given, *May 8,* 213.
Proceedings, Proposals for Publication of—Dissatisfaction with Abridgements issued by Colonial Office etc., *May 8,* 212; *May 16,* 1098.
Imports from Colonies and British Possessions in 1905, *May 13,* 628, 629.
Income-Tax
Aggregate of Incomes lying between £160 and £700, *May 15,* 957.
Refund, Facilitating Process of, proposed, *May 14,* 887, 888.

[*cont.*

**Pease, Mr. P.**—*cont.*
  Morocco, Condition of and Measures taken to protect British Subjects, *May 15*, 954.
  Opium Cure tried in Malay States, Value of, *May 27*, 1315.
  Soudan—Date of Evacuation of Bahr-el-Ghazal by Congolese Troops, *May 28*, 1471.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Revised Estimates and Memoranda, Date of Tabling, *May 16*, 1095.
  Transvaal Mines—Strike of White Miners, Employment of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 29*, 1637.
  Vagrancy Committee, Date of giving Effect to Recommendations of, *May 23*, 1216.
  Volunteer Artillery, Proposals as to, under new Scheme, *May 14*, 783.

**Pease, Mr. J. A.**—*Lord of the Treasury* [Essex, Saffron Walden]
  Alton Military Hospital, Use of, *May 15*, 948.
  Army
    Sandhurst Cadets, Cause for Delay in Gazetting, *May 16*, 1094.
    Special Contingent, Pay of, *May 16*, 1094.
  Empire Day—Hoisting of Flag on War Office, proposed, *May 16*, 1093.
  Hilsea War Office Land, Letting of, *May 16*, 1093.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Date of Tabling Revised Estimate and Memoranda, *May 16*, 1095.
  Yeomanry—Decision as to Retention of Bayonet, *May 16*, 1094.

**Penrith Urban District Council Bill**
  *c.* Report from Police and Sanitary Committee, *May 10*, 532.
  *Con.** *May 23*, 1150.
  3R.* *May 27*, 1294.
  *l.* 1R.* *May 28*, 1450.

**Percy, Earl** [Kensington, S.]
  Congo Free State, Belgian Administration of—Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives—Responsibility of Great Britain, etc., *May 15*, 991–994.

**Persia**
  Order in Council Entitled Persian Coast and Islands, Presented, *May 28*, 1454, 1462.

**Peru**
  Extradition Treaty—Copy of Order in Council, Presented, *May 28*, 1452, 1462.
  Treaty as to Mutual Surrender of Fugitive Criminals, Presented, *May 23*, 1152; *May 28*, 1454.

**Petty Session Clerks (Ireland) Bill**
  *c.* 1R.* *May 8*, 245.

**Philipps, Mr. O. C.** [Pembroke and Haverfordwest]
  Jamaica Earthquake — Decision as to Government Grant, *May 8*, 218.

**Physique of the Nation**
  Betterment or Deterioration during last ten years, Statistics as to.
    *Q.* Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 29*, 1641.

**Pickersgill, Mr. E. H.** [Bethnal Green, S.W.]
  Customs Outdoor Staff, Conditions of Service of, *May 16*, 1131–1133.
  Natal—Cause for Arrest of Mr. J. Gumede, *May 16*, 1096.
  Prisons
    Executive Boards, appointment of Women on, proposed, *May 23*, 1214, 1215.
    Governors, Policy of Appointing Naval and Military Officers, *May 23*, 1214.
    Solitary Confinement for Children, Objections to, *May 23*, 1213.
    Warders, Encouragement of better class of Men, proposed, *May 23*, 1214.
    Women Inspectors, Appointment of, proposed, *May 23*, 1215.
  Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 296.
  Vaccination Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1284.

**Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill**
  *l.* 2R.* *May 7*, 2.

**Piers and Harbours**
  [*See also names of places*
  Ireland
    Grants since 1840.
      *Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 780, 781.
    Harbours Inspected with a view to Improvement.
      *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 13*, 583.
      *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 27*, 1300.

**Pirie, Mr. D. V.** [Aberdeen, N.]
  Scottish Grand Committee, Constitution of, *May 15*, 1026, 1027.

**Plague**
  Memorandum of Royal College of Physicians, ordered, *May 15*, 928 — Order Discharged and Return of Memorandum ordered, *May 29*, 1612.

**Plymouth and North Devon Direct Railways (Abandonment) Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 8,* 197.
*Rep,* May 14,* 733.
3R.* *May 16,* 1069.

**Police**
Metropolitan—Increase and Weekly Day of Rest, Proposals as to.
*Qs.* Mr. Courthope, Mr. Thorne; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 29,* 1640, 1641.

**Political Pensions Bill**
*c. Com.* May 9,* 460.

**Polling Districts**
[*See also names of places.*]
Orders Altering, Presented, *May 14,* 735, 769; *May 16,* 1070, 1077.

**Pontefract**
Secondary School Site, Conditions of Offer of.
*Q.* Mr. Nussey; *A.* Sir H. Fowler, *May 9,* 366, 367.

**Pontypridd Urban District Council Bill**
*l. Rep.* May 14,* 733.
3R.* *May 28,* 1449.
*c.* 1R.* *May 29,* 1610.

**Poor Law**
Children Boarded-out in the Country—Payment of Cost of Educating.
*Q.* Mr. Hart - Davies; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 14,* 795.
Scotland—Number of Persons in Receipt of Parochial Relief.
*Q.* Mr. Esslemont; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 13,* 641, 642.

**Port of London**
Legislative Proposals as to Provision of Dock, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 29,* 1643.

**Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 8,* 197.

**Portsmouth**
Dockyard, *see under* Navy.
Naval Barracks, *see under* Navy.

**Portsmouth, Earl of**—*Under-Secretary of State for War.*
Soldiers, Civil Employment for, on Discharge
Circular issued by War Office, Results of issuing Papers, proposed, *May 29,* 1603, 1604.
Trades, Teaching of, while in the Army, *May 29,* 1604–1606.

**Post Office**
*Postmaster-General*—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.
[*See also names of places.*]
Associations, Recognition of, as Trade Unions.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 387; Mr. Wilkie, 403, 404.
Betting Circulars, Steps taken to check Transmission of through the Post.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 380, 381.
Blind Persons, Reduction of Postage on Literature for.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 379, 380.
Change, Regulations as to supplying to the Public.
*Os.* Colonel Lockwood, *May 9,* 412; Mr. Buxton, 412.
Contracts—Abandonment of Custom of accepting Lowest Tender.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 383, 416; Sir F. Banbury, 394.
Employees—Conditions of Employment, Rate of Pay, etc.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 382; Mr. Maclean, 412.
Committee of Inquiry into.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 384, 385.
Estimates—Allowance made for Depreciation in Value of Buildings, etc.
*O.* Mr. Walrond; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 29,* 1613, 1614.
Financial Position of.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 376; Mr. H. Heaton, 388; Sir F. Banbury, 394.
Holloway Factory
New policy as to Employment at.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 384.
"Suggestion System," Adoption of.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 384.
Ireland
Business—Revenue and Expenditure (1890–1906).
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 14,* 773.
Stores in—Selection of Staff for New Branch.
*Q.* Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 7,* 76.
Letter Carriers, Rate of Wages paid to.
*Os.* Mr. O'Grady, *May 9,* 405.
Letters
Deliveries in Remote Parts, Increase in Number of.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9,* 378; Mr. Morton, 409, 410.
Rule as to Re-direction by Post Office.
*Q.* Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 7,* 70.

[*cont.*

**Post Office**—*cont.*

Lottery Circulars, Rule as to Transmission of.
*Q.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 380, 381.
*Qs.* Mr. Bottomley, Mr. Markham; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 362, 363.
*Q.* Mr. G. A. Hardy; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 29*, 1641.

Mail Cart Drivers, Increase in Wages of, and Provision of Uniform for.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 383, 415; Mr. Seddon, 400, 401; Mr. O'Grady, 406; Mr. Morton, 407, 415.

Mail Service

All-British Scheme

Coaling of Ships, Provisions as to.
*Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 23*, 1162.

Proposals as to investigating Scheme for.
*Q.* Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 29*, 1656.

American, Information as to—Return (1905 and 1906) Ordered, *May 9*, 337.

Eastern Mail Packet Contract, Information as to New Arrangements for.
*Qs.* Sir H. Cotton, Mr. Laidlaw; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 27*, 1324, 1325.

Hong Kong, Complaints as to Service with.
*Q.* Mr. Holt; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 14*, 793, 794.

San Francisco and New Zealand—Resumption of Three-weekly Service, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Fell, *May 9*, 422.

Money-lenders, Compelling insertion of Names and Addresses on Envelopes used by.
*Os.* Mr. Nield, *May 9*, 426; Mr. Buxton, 427.

Motor Vans, Increasing Number of, proposed.
*Os.* Colonel Lockwood, *May 9*, 412.

Mount Pleasant Joinery Department, Conditions of Employment at.
*Os.* Mr. O'Grady, *May 9*, 406.

Newspaper Postal Rates, Anomalies of.
*Os.* Mr. Wilkie, *May 9*, 404; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 419–421; Mr. Buxton, 428.

Parcel Post

China, Arrangements for sending Registered Parcels to.
*Q.* Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 27*, 1299.

Foreign and Colonial Warrant, Presented, *May 13*, 535, 569.

**Post Office**—*cont.*

Pension and Superannuation System, Information as to.
*Os.* Sir F. Banbury, *May 9*, 395; Mr. Wiles, 405.

Permanent Officials, Criticisms on Policy of.
*Os.* Mr. Morton, *May 9*, 408; Colonel Lockwood, 410, 411; Mr. Buxton, 413, 414; Mr. H. Heaton, 414.

Postage—Foreign Rates

Anomalies of.
*Os.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 9*, 390; Mr. Morton, 407.

Changes in.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 379; Mr. A. Bryce, 391.

Newspaper Rates to Canada, Reduction in.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 379; Mr. H. Heaton, 389; Sir G. Parker, 398.

Penny Post with United States, Establishment of, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 9*, 390.

Postal Orders

Irish Business, transfer to Ireland, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 14*, 773.

Poundage on Lower Demominations Reduction of.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 378

Postcards, Picture, falling off in Revenue derived from.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 376.

Postmasters

Sub-Postmasters in Shops, Conditions of Service of.
*Os.* Mr. J. D. White, *May 9*, 422, 423.

System of Advertising Vacancies.
*Q.* Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 338.

Public Service Board to deal with all Questions relating to, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 9*, 389, 390; Sir G. Parker, 399; Mr. Wilkie, 404; Mr. O'Grady, 406.

Relatives of Supervising Officials, Rule as to

Case of Telegraphist at Brighton.
*Q.* Mr. D. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 10*, 462, 463.

Date of modifying Regulations.
*Q.* Mr. D. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 16*, 1084.

Sanitary Condition of London Offices, Inquiry into—Proposals for presenting Report.
*Q.* Mr. Myer; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 15*, 932.

[*cont.*

**Post Office**—*cont.*

Seniority, Loss of—Possibility of recovering by subsequent Good Service.
*Q.* Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 14*, 794, 795.

Stamps, Automatic Machines for supply of.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 380.

*Statement* [Mr. Buxton], *May 9*, 376–388.

Surveying Department, Promotion System in.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 940.

Trade Orders, Reasons for New Regulations as to.
*Os.* Mr. Bowles, *May 9*, 423.

Typists, Women

Catering Arrangements for.
*Os.* Colonel Lockwood, *May 9*, 411, 412.

Increase in Salaries of, proposed.
*Os.* Sir G. Parker, *May 9*, 398; Mr. Seddon, 402; Colonel Lockwood, 411; Mr. Buxton, 414.

Vote for, *May 9*, 375.

**Post Office Savings Bank**

Interest, Reduction in, to prevent Deficiency, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Walrond; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 13*, 591, 592.

Irish Business

Transfer to Ireland, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton. *May 14*, 774, 775.

Withdrawals during 1906.
*Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton. *May 14*, 772, 773.

Limit of £2,000

Accounts exceeding, through Accumulation of Interest—Return proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Walrond; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 592.

Extension of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Walrond; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 593.

Telegraphic Withdrawals, Working of System.
*Os.* Mr. Weir, *May 9*, 424; Mr. Buxton, 427.

Unclaimed Balances, Amount of and Proposals for utilising.
*Q.* Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 15*, 942.

**Post Office Sites Bill**
*c.* 1 and 2R.,* *May 8*, 278.

**Powell, Sir F. S.** [Wigan]

Education

Code, Date of Circulating, *May 15*, 962.

Secondary Schools, Date of Submitting Proposals as to, *May 15*, 962.

Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 710.

**President of the Board of Agriculture**
*Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.*

**President of the Board of Education**
*Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.*

**President of the Board of Trade**
*Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.*

**President of the Local Government Board**
*Rt. Hon. J. Burns.*

**Prevention of Corruption Act**

Scotland, Complaints as to Evasions in.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 7*, 71, 72.

**Price, Mr. C. E.** [Edinburgh, Central]

Bazaar Raffles, Legality of, in Scotland, *May 9*, 371.

Egypt—British Consuls, Qualifications of, *May 14*, 780.

**Primogeniture Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 8*, 244.

**Printing and Stationery**

Government Printing Office, Establishment of, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 9*, 390.

**Prisons**

[*See also names of places.*]

Dietary, Alleged Inadequacy of.
*Os.* Mr. Markham, *May 23*, 1217; Mr. Gladstone, 1218; Mr. Cochrane, 1223, 1224.

First Offenders, Necessity for differentiating Prison Treatment of.
*Os.* Mr. P. Pease, *May 23*, 1216; Mr. Gladstone, 1221, 1222.

Governors, Policy of appointing Naval and Military Officers as.
*Os.* Mr. Pickersgill, *May 23*, 1214; Mr. Gladstone, 1220; Mr. Cochrane, 1223.

Inspectors, Women, Appointment of, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Pickersgill, *May 23*, 1215; Mr. Markham, 1217; Mr. Gladstone, 1221; Mr. Cochrane, 1223; Mr. Byles, 1225.

Solitary Confinement for Children, Objections to.
*Os.* Mr. Pickersgill, *May 23*, 1213.

Vote for, *May 23*, 1211.

Warders

Encouragement of Better Class of men, proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Pickersgill, *May 23*, 1214; Mr. Markham, 1217; Mr. Gladstone, 1220.

Housing Accommodation for, Desirability of providing within the Precincts of Prisons.
*Os.* Mr. Cochrane, *May 23*, 1225.

[*cont.*

**Prisons**—*cont.*
  Women, Non-representation of, on Executive Boards.
    *Os.* Mr. Pickersgill, *May 23*, 1214, 1215; Mr. Gladstone, 1220; Mr. Byles, 1225.

**Prize Courts Bill**
  *l.* 2R., *May 8*, 200.
  *Com.* and *Rep.* May 14*, 763.
  3R,* *May 15*, 922.

**Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill**
  *c.* 2R., *May 8*, 294.

**Public Demonstrations**
  Cost of, Inconvenience caused by and Police employed in regulating.
    *Qs.* Sir H. Vincent, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 15*, 958, 959.

**Public Health Bill**
  *c.* 2R.* *May 14*, 919.

**Public Rights of Way (No. 2) Bill**
  *c.* 2R.* *May 27*, 1448.

**Purity of Milk Supplies (Scotland) Bill**
  *c.* 1R.* *May 28*, 1480.

**Qualification of Women (County and Borough Councils) Bill**
  *l.* 1R.* *May 14*, 764.
  Second Reading, Date of taking.
    *Os.* Lord James of Hereford, Earl of Crewe, Earl of Halsbury, *May 15*, 925.

**Quarries**
  Report and Statistics (1906) Presented, *May 9*, 334; *May 13*, 534.

**Questions**
  Argumentative Question not in Order, *May 15*, 974.
  Irrelevant, *May 7*, 71; *May 8*, 231, 236, 240; *May 15*, 980.
  Notice to be given of, *May 7*, 57; *May 13*, 619, 626.
  Repetition not in Order, *May 13*, 643; *May 16*, 1111.

**Radford, Mr. G. H.** [Islington, E.]
  Women serving on Local Authorities—Proposals for Legislation, *May 13*, 638.

**Railways**
  Accidents and Casualties—Return Presented, *May 13*, 534, 569.
  Baker Street and Waterloo Trains, Inadequate Accommodation in.
    *Q.* Mr. Bridgeman; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 7*, 67.

**Railways**—*cont.*
  Dangerous Goods, Inclusion of Varnish among—Right of Appeal from Decision, etc.
    *Q.* Mr. Brunner; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 13*, 635.
  Engines running Tender first, Danger involved by.
    *Q.* Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 15*, 945.
  Metropolitan District
    Whistles and Sirens, Annoyance caused by.
      *Q.* Mr. Stanger; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 14*, 776.
    Workmen's Fares charged by.
      *Q.* Mr. C. Money; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 13*, 635, 636.
  Passengers' Luggage, Regulations as to Insurance of.
    *Qs.* Mr. Lloyd-Morgan; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 9*, 359, 360.
  Returns—Preliminary Statement Presented, *May 14*, 735, 768.
  Workmen's Trains, *see that title.*

**Randles, Sir J.** [Cumberland, Cockermouth]
  Business of the House, Course of and Proposals as to certain Bills, *May 27*, 1334.
  Merchant Shipping (Tonnage Deduction for Propelling Power) Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1270.
  Russo - Japanese War — Compensation Claims for British Vessels seized by Russian Cruisers, *May 23*, 1165.
  Small Holdings, Demand for and Supplies available—Tabling Evidence in Parliamentary Papers proposed, *May 23*, 1166.

**Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P** [Cambridge University]
  Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 282, 284, 286.
    Effect of Clause 12, *May 27*, 1328, 1329.
  Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 709.
  Law Courts—King's Bench Division, Cases Standing for Trial in, *May 27*, 1326, 1328.
  Post Office Sites Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 280.
  Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 298.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
    Agricultural Commissioners
      Limiting Expenses in connection with to £5,000 per Annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1363–1365.
      Salaries, Limiting Expenses in respect of, to £3,000 per Annum., proposed, *May 27*, 1339–1342.

[*cont.*

**Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P.**—*cont.*
Small Landowners (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
Land Court, Limiting Expenses in respect of to £6,000 per Annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1347–1349.
Salaries, Authorising Payment of out of Consolidated Fund, *May 24*, 1242–1244.

**Reddy, Mr. M.** [Kings County, Birr]
Roscomroe, Grazing Farm held by Mr. Luttrell—Measures taken by Police to protect Cattle, *May 8*, 231.

**Redhill**
Hemsley, F. T., Decision in Case of.
*Q.* Mr. Courthope: *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 8*, 221.

**Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]**
Arterial Drainage, Necessity for dealing with the subject, *May 13*, 122, 123.
Education, Intermediate, Inadequacy of Grants for, *May 13*, 124.
Irish Council Bill, Intro, May , 100, 112–128, 131, 176.

**Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]**
Clare County Council Grants, Deduction from, *May 9*, 374.
Punjab Disturbances, Information as to and Measures taken to deal with, *May 13*, 614.

**Reenard**
Pier Construction, Decision as to.
*Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 966.

**Rees, Mr. J. D.** [Montgomery Boroughs]
Africa, Central—Education, Grant in Aid for, *May 27*, 1313.
Africa, East
Senoussi Movement, Allegations as to Spread of, *May 13*, 623.
Steamship Communication with—proposals for encouragement of British Lines, *May 29*, 1634.
Army—Territorial Force, Accounts of County Associations, Audit of, *May 9*, 352.
Baghdad Railway, Position of Great Britain with regard to, *May 15*, 1009, 1010.
Camberwell Infirmary, etc., Cost of, *May 16*, 1100.
Coal Mines—Welsh-speaking Inspectors, Decision as to, *May 23*, 1177.
Congo Free State—Belgian Administration, Charges of Ill-treatment of Natives—Responsibility of Great Britain, etc., *May 15*, 1009.
Government Property, Rates on, Assessment, Method adopted for, *May 16*, 1114.

**Rees, Mr. J. D.**—*cont.*
Hague Conference—British Delegates' Powers as to signing of Conventions, etc., *May 29*, 1639.
Hammersmith Workhouse and Infirmary at Wormwood Scrubbs, Cost of and Accommodation provided in, *May 13*, 639.
Income Tax on Earned Incomes, Pensions, Annuities, etc., Position of, *May 8*, 254, 255.
India
Condition of, Facilities for Discussing—Removal of Blocking Motion proposed, *May 15*, 981.
Punjab
Land Revenue System, Effect of, *May 16*, 1096.
Rawal Pindi Land Tax and Irrigation Cess, Charges under, *May 29*, 1633.
Railway Rolling Stock, Suggestion for obviating inadequacy of, *May 9*, 345.
Telegraph Rates to, Proposals as to Reduction of, *May 9*, 426.
Natal British Indians, Trading Licences of—Complaints as to Administration of Law, *May 13*, 620.
Nigeria — Indians from the Punjab, Appointments Resigned by, etc. *May 27*, 1314.
Opium
Chinese Proposals for Restricting Traffic—Memorial from Shanghai Traders, *May 29*, 1639, 1640.
Good Health Conferred by Moderate use of — Allegation in Report of Central Africa Commissioner, *May 23*, 1163.

**Reformatory and Industrial Schools**
Vote for, *May 23*, 1227.

**Reformatory and Industrial Schools (No 2) Bill**
c. 1R.* *May 7*, 77.

**Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill**
c. 2R., *May 24*, 1291.

**Remnant, Mr. J. F.** [Finsbury, Holborn]
Africa, South—Garrison, Stores and Supplies sent in 1906, Value and Discription, *May 8*, 207, 208.
Exports and Imports for Military Stations Abroad, Record kept of, *May 8*, 222.

**Rendall, Mr. A.** [Gloucester, Thornbury]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 869–871.
Fiscal Policy, Adaptation of, to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 14*, 869–871.

**Restraint of Trade (Shops) Bill**
c. 1R.* *May 8*, 244.

**Revenue and Expenditure**
Amount Raised by Taxes in 1906–7.
*Q.* Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 10*, 464, 465.
Financial Position of the Country, Necessity for Strengthening.
*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 653, 654.
Statistics of Expenditure for 1846–1849, 1880–1886, 1895 and 1907–8.
*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 656.

**Richards, Mr. T. F.** [Wolverhampton, W.]
Hereford—Scudamore Charity, Administration of—Proposals as to Inquiry, *May 9*, 367.

**Ridley, Viscount**
Sugar Beet Cultivation in British Isles—Establishment of Manufactories, Question of Remitting Excise Duty, etc., *May 13*, 556–559.
Tobacco Cultivation in Ireland—Government Assistance Towards, *May 13*, 557, 558.

**Ridsdale, Mr. E. A.** [Brighton]
Infant Mortality—Statistics as to Certain Boroughs (1897–1906), *May 29*, 1616.
Milk—Receipts from and Cost of Working Municipal Depots, *May 23*, 1154.

**Rifle Clubs**
Army Rifles Unsuitable for Conversion, Issue of, proposed.
*Qs.* Mr. Carlile, Major Anstruther Gray; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 605, 606.

**Rinneen**
Shooting Outrage on J. Murphy from behind a Hedge, Cause of, and Arrests made for.
*Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 968.

**Ripon, Marquess of**—*Lord Privy Seal.*
Companies Bill, *Rep.*, *May 14*, 761.
Destructive Insects and Pests Bill, 3R., *May 13*, 564.
House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 7*, 39–42.
House of Lords Reform Proposals—Government Attitude towards Select Committee of Inquiry, *May 13*, 536, 537.
Municipal Representation Bill—Select Committee, Appointment of Certain Lords, *May 14*, 763.
Parliamentary Elections—Seamen's Disabilities, Removal of, Appointment of Committee of Inquiry, proposed, *May 13*, 545.

**Roads**
Maintenance of, when altered by Construction of Railways—Liability of Companies.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1613.

**Roberts, Mr. C. H.** [Lincoln]
Army Barracks without Accommodation for Royal Army Temperance Association, *May 16*, 1090.
Liquor Traffic—Statistics as to Licensed Premises on 1st January, *May 27*, 1320.

**Roberts, Mr. G. H.** [Norwich]
Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 709.

**Roberts, Mr. J. H.** [Denbighshire, W.]
Amritsar—Number of Licences Issued for Sale of Spirits, *May 14*, 772.

**Roberts, Mr. S.** [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
Income Tax, Reduction of, to 11d. in the £, proposed, *May 8*, 245.
War Taxes, Possibility of remitting, *May 8*, 245, 246.

**Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.**—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Dundee]
Admiralty Contracts
- Articles for which Contractors are not bound to use British Materials, *May 13*, 604.
- Beer Contracts, Allocation of, *May 9*, 351, 352.

"Ariel," Loss of—Proposals for Inquiry, *May 9*, 343.
Australasian Squadron—Understanding as to Colonial Contribution, etc., arrived at in Colonial Conference, *May 13*, 603.
Boys, Training of—Hours spent at Sea by "Magnificent" and "Victorious," *May 16*, 1092.
Deptford Victualling Yard, Hours of Labour and Holidays at—Proposals as to Admiralty Visit, etc., *May 15*, 931, 932.
Derelicts at Sea, Danger from and Proposals as to searching for, *May 9*, 351.
Dock Book—Date of last Edition, etc., *May 28*, 1463.
Dockyard Writers, Effect of new Scheme on Pay and Promotion of, *May 14*, 782; *May 16*, 1083, 1084.
Engineers
- Assistants entering for Temporary Service, Circular applied to, *May 28*, 1464.
- Inquiry—Decision as to Publishing Reports, *May 23*, 1159.

Foreign Navies, Number of British Seamen joining—Condition of Service in Royal Fleet Reserve, *May 9*, 338.

**Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.**—*cont.*

German Naval Recruits, Age, and Training of, *May 9*, 344.

Greenwich Observatory—Progress of Negotiations as to London County Council Electric Station, *May 14*, 781.

Gunnery Practice, Regulations as to carrying out in fine weather only, *May 27*, 1306.

Imperial Conference, 1907

  Australasian Naval Squadron, Understanding as to, *May 13*, 603.

" Indefatigable " and " Scylla," Speed of, *May 13*, 575.

Lyddite Shell, Tenders for—Allocation of Contracts at Woolwich, etc., *May 13*, 604.

Manœuvres, Decision as to, *May 13*, 575. *May 28*, 1468.

Marines, Royal

  Officers, Details of new Scheme for, *May 7*, 56.

  Report on, Date of completing, and Proposals for Tabling, *May 28*, 1468.

" Mars " and " Hannibal "—Source of Supply of Men to complete Crews, *May 15*, 930.

Midshipmen, Payment by, for instruction, *May 27*, 1305.

Nucleus Crews, Night Training at Sea, Information as to, *May 7*, 55.

Obsolete Vessels

  Conditions of Sale of, and Proposals for Utilising, *May 9*, 350.

  Value of certain Vessels if sold without Condition as to Breaking-up, *May 14*, 782.

  Vessels in the Holy Loch, original Cost of and Price obtained for, *May 8*, 207.

Pensions—Case of G. Day, *May 16*, 1083.

Portsmouth Barracks Disturbance—Remission of Remainder of Sentences, proposed, *May 16*, 1079.

Portsmouth Dockyards

  Chargemen of Labourers, Wages of, *May 8*, 204.

  Date of Admiralty Visit to, *May 29*, 1621.

Portsmouth

  Naval Gunnery Training Establishment Staff, Proposals for Reducing, *May 27*, 1306.

Rosyth

  Price paid for—Names of Valuators. etc., *May 7*, 56, 57.

  Value of surrounding Land, Effect of Establishment of Dockyard on, *May 9*, 351.

Sailors' Kits, Free Grant of, proposed, *May 27*, 1305.

**Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.**—*cont.*

Torpedo Boat Destroyers, Armament of, *May 27*, 1306.

Torpedo Boat Flotilla at Sheerness and Chatham, Information as to, *May 15*, 930.

Torpedoes—Number Manufactured in 1907 and Allocation of Contracts, *May 16*, 1092.

**Robertson, Mr. J. M.** [Northumberland, Tyneside]

Customs

  First-class Examining Officerships, Examination, for, since 1891, *May 14*, 798.

  Out-door Staff, Conditions of Service of, *May 16*, 1133, 1134.

Egypt

  British Consuls, Qualifications of, *May 14*, 789.

  Cairo Post and Customs Offices, Observation of Moslem Day of Rest in, *May 14*, 790.

  Cotton Duty, Abolition or Reduction of proposed, *May 7*, 63.

  Departmental Reports, Practice as to Communicating to Legislative Council, *May 7*, 63.

  Frontier Delimitation—Progress of Negotiation with Turkey, *May 7*, 64.

  Government Service—Facilities for Examination of Natives, *May 28*, 1469.

  Ministry of Justice, British Judges and Officers Attached to, *May 14*, 788.

  Railways

    Administration, Improvement in, proposed, *May 28*, 1469.

    Time Tables, Method of Advertising, *May 28*, 1470.

  Sunday Closing of Shops, Regulations as to, *May 7*, 63.

Old-Age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 508–513.

**Robertson, Sir G. S.** [Bradford, Central]

Army Pensions—Inclusion of Aged Poor Soldiers not in Possession of Medal proposed, *May 29*, 1628.

**Robertsbridge and Pevensey Light Railway**

Order Presented, *May 14*, 734, 768.

**Robson, Sir W. S.**—*Solicitor-General* [South Shields]

Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1439–1441.

**Roche, Mr. A.** [Cork]

Lincolnshire, Crime in—Condition of Brigg, Division, *May 8*, 219.

**Rogers, Mr. F. N.** [Wilts, Devizes]
- Rural Districts, Depopulation of
  - Causes of, Statistics as to, and Necessity for Dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 300–303.
  - Farm Products, Encouragement of, proposed, *May 8*, 305.
  - Tariff Reform as a Remedy, *May 8*, 304.
- Small Holdings
  - Crown Lands, Experiments with, *May 8*, 307.
  - Demand for, Rents Charged per acre, etc., *May 8*, 306.
- Swine Fever Regulations, Inconvenience Caused by, *Moy 23*, 1175; *May 13*, 641.

**Roo**
- Uneconomic Holdings—Proposals for Purchase of Untenanted Land.
  - *Q.* Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 372, 373.

**Roscomroe**
- Grazing Farm Held by Mr. Luttrell—Measures taken by Police to Protect Cattle.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Reddy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *May 8*, 230, 231.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 29*, 1649.

**Rosebery, Earl of**
- House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 7*, 16–29.

**Rosmead, Lord**
- Union Jack Club, Controller of, Application for Appointment of Officer in the Indian Army, *May 16*, 1073.

**Rosyth Naval Base**
- *See under* Navy.

**Roumania**
- Trade Report Presented, *May 15*, 922.

**Royal Bank of Scotland Bill**
- *c.* 2R.* *May 13*, 567,

**Runciman, Mr. W.**—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Dewsbury]
- Alien Immigration Officers, Information as to Work Done by, *May 16*, 1139.
- Brixton Land Tax Commissioners, Meetings of, *May 27*, 1296.
- Cahirciveen Pier Improvements, Decision as to, *May 15*, 960.
- Civil Service
  - Boy Clerks, Reply to Memorial from, *May 14*, 798.
  - Promotions from the Ranks Opposed by the Treasury During the last Five Years, *May 15*, 940.

**Runciman, Mr. W.**—*cont.*
- Clare County Council Grants, Deductions from, *May 9*, 374.
- Congo Free State, Belgian Annexation, Official Information as to Proposals for, *May 13*, 627.
- Consols (2½ per cent.)—Amount in May 1906 and 1907, *May 15*, 957.
- Crown Lands—Arrangements for Letting, *May 14*, 771.
- Customs and Excise
  - First Class Examining Officerships of Customs, Examinations for, Since 1891, *May 14*, 798.
  - Naval Officers, Proposals for Appointing to Superior Positions in Customs Staff, *May 7*, 54.
  - Outdoor Staff, Conditions of Service of, *May 16*, 1140.
  - Promotion System in Customs Department, *May 9*, 342.
  - Reserve Soldiers and Sailors, Number Employed, *May 16*, 1139.
  - Statistical Branch—Annual Leave of Assistant Clerks (New Class), *May 9*, 343; *May 16*, 1140.
  - Vote for—Increase Due to Increments of Salaries, *May 15*, 941.
  - Watchers, Overtime of, in 1906, *May 27*, 1298.
- Diplomatic and Consular Service—Reason for Increase in Estimate for Consular Service, *May 15*, 957.
- Egypt—Assouan Dam, Nationality of Workmen Employed, *May 13*, 625, 626.
- Exchequer and Audit Department, Hours of Labour of Officials, *May 16*, 1116.
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 906–912.
- Fiscal Policy
  - Adaptation of, to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, *May 14*, 907–912.
  - Industries of the Country, Effect of Free Trade System on, *May 14*, 906, 911.
  - Manufactured Goods, 10 per cent. Tax on, *May 14*, 909.
- Government Property, Rates on
  - Apartments Provided in Royal Palaces, Reason for Defraying Rates out of Public Funds, *May 16*, 1113.
  - Assessment, Method Adopted for, *May 16*, 1115.
  - Houses Occupied by Foreign Representatives, Amount Paid on, *May 16*, 1115.
- Gravesend Water-Guard Inspector—Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16*, 1122, 1123, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1128.

**Runciman, Mr. W.**—*cont.*
- Income Tax
  - Aggregate of Incomes Lying between £160 and £700, *May 15*, 958.
  - Poor Rates, Copies of, Cost of Providing for Purposes of Income Tax, *May 16*, 1142, 1143, 1144.
- Inland Revenue Department Supervising Officers—Memorial for Inquiry into Conditions of Service and Pay, *May 16*, 1147.
- Ireland
  - Ancient Monuments, Arrangements for Preserving, *May 13*, 584.
  - County and Borough Council Grants, Deductions from—Proposals for Obviating, etc., *May 13*, 586.
  - Estimates, Surpluses on Votes Surrendered Since 1903, etc., *May 15*, 941.
  - Financial Relations with Great Britain—Revenue and Expenditure during last Twenty Years, *May 15*, 935, 940.
  - Government Buildings, Use of Irish Materials in Constructing, *May 14*, 778.
  - Harbours Inspected with a View of Improvement, *May 13*, 583.
  - Loan Capital Duty Claimed from District Councils, Non-Assessment of, proposed, *May 15*, 936.
  - Quit Rents, Accumulated Funds derived from and Expenditure of, *May 15*, 935.
  - Works Board, and System of appointing Clerks in—Allegations against Sir R. Holmes, *May 8*, 240.
- Jamaica—Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, Telegram as to Action, Procedure taken in sending to United States by War Office, *May 8*, 214.
- Land Purchase
  - Treasury Rules under Act of 1903—Discussion of Amendments proposed, *May 8*, 241.
  - Zone System, Facilities for Fraud given by and Proposals for Prevention of Inclusion of Extraneous Debts in Prices, *May 8*, 240.
- Law Courts—Supreme Court of Judicature Clerks—Number serving over Forty Years, *May 8*, 225.
- Liverpool Bonded Warehouses for deposit of Wines and Spirits, Number of and Arrangements for taking charge of, *May 27*, 1298.
- Local Government Board Pension System—Case of Senior Assistant Clerk, *May 16*, 1100.
- Marine Biological Association Committee, Decision as to, *May 13*, 632.

**Runciman, Mr. W.**—*cont.*
- Mayo County Council Grant, Deduction from in respect of Land Purchase, *May 10*, 464.
- Merchant Shipping (Deduction for Propelling Powers) Bill—Effect on Powers granted to Certain Authorities as to Levy of Dues, *May 15*, 961.
- Mint
  - Appropriation-in-aid, Explanation of, *May 16*, 1119.
  - Gold Coinage, Reason for Increased Loss on, *May 16*, 1118.
  - Hours of Labour of Officials, *May 16*, 1119.
  - Police, Charge for, *May 16*, 1117.
  - Silver Coinage, Loss on—Allowance by Bullion Brokers, etc., *May 16*, 1119.
  - Wages, Salaries and Allowances, Increase in Estimate for, *May 16*, 1117.
- Morocco, Condition of, and Measures taken to protect British subjects, *May 15*, 954.
- National Debt Office Salaries, Explanation of Increased Estimate for, *May 16*, 1120.
- National Physical Laboratory Inquiry, Constitution of Committee, *May 8*, 206.
- Naval Dockyards Assessment of—Method adopted, *May 16*, 1115.
- Panama Canal, British Emigrants employed at—Rate of Sickness, etc., *May 15*, 955, 956.
- Post Office, Surveying Department, Promotion System in, *May 15*, 940.
- Revenue and Expenditure—Amount raised by Taxes in 1906–7, *May 10*, 465.
- Salonica—Position of Negotiations for Repayment of ransom in Abbott Case, *May 15*, 955.
- Shanghai—Circumstances of Murder of Police Constable Morrow, etc., *May 13*, 626.
- Superannuation
  - Decision as to reckoning Military Service of Civil Servants, *May 15*, 957.
  - Residence Abroad, Regulations as to Payment of Pensions during, *May 29*, 1621.
- Taxation
  - Basis of, Necessity for Widening, *May 15*, 907–912.
  - Local—Payments to Irish Account (1901–5), *May 15*, 978.
- Transvaal Loan, Procedure in Guaranteeing, *May 13*, 632.
- Truro-Helston—Alleged Evasion of Land Tax Commissioners' Act, *May 16*, 1099.

[*cont.*

**Runciman, Mr. W.**—*cont.*
  University Colleges
    Grant, Allocation of, *May 9*, 366.
    Report of Inspectors, Date of Tabling, *May 9*, 366.

**Rural Districts**
  Depopulation of
    Causes of, Statistics as to, and Necessity for dealing with the Question.
      *Os.* Mr. Rogers, *May 8*, 300–303, 308; Mr. Walker, 308–314; Sir J. Kennaway, 314; Mr. Black, 315; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 316; Sir F. Channing, 317; Mr. Parker, 318; Colonel Lockwood, 319–321; Mr. Beck, 321; Colonel Kenyon - Slaney, 322; Sir E. Strachey, 321–324; Mr. H. Beach, 331, 332.
    Farm Products, Encouragement of proposed.
      *Os.* Mr. Rogers, *May 8*, 305; Mr. Walker, 309.
    Tariff Reform as a Remedy.
      *Os.* Mr. Rogers, *May 8*, 304; Sir F. Channing, 317; Sir E. Strachey, 325.
  Water Supply in, Difficulty of Securing—Legislation to deal with Matter, proposed.
    *Qs.* Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. Burns, *May 9*, 361, 362.

**Russell, Earl**
  Anomalies in *Status* of Naturalised British Subjects, Removal of, proposed, *May 15*, 922–924.

**Russell, Mr. T. W.** [Tyrone, S.]
  Belpatrick Farms, Sale Proposals for, *May 13*, 596.
  Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 144–146.
  Irish Court Houses—Vesting in County Councils, proposed, *May 13*, 594.
  Standing Committee A—Circumstances of Adjournment on 13th instant, *May 14*, 801.

**Russia**
  Trade Reports, Presented, *May 7*, 2; *May 28*, 1450, 1451.

**Russian Social Democrats**
  Conference in London—Allegations as to Police Espionage, etc.
    *Qs.* Mr. Thorne, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 27*, 1319, 1320.

**Russo-Japanese War**
  British Vessels seized by Russian Cruisers—Progress of Negotiations as to Claims.
    *Q.* Sir J. Randles; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 23*, 1165.

**Rutherford, Dr. V. H.** [Middlesex, Brentford
  German Colonial Legislative Proposals as to British Indians, *May 29*, 1631.
  India
    Arrests and Imprisonment without Trial during last eighty-nine Years, *May 15*, 949.
    Condition of, Facilities for discussing—Removal of Blocking Motion, proposed, *May 15*, 981, 982.
    Plague, Deaths from in April and since 1896, *May 15*, 949.
    Punjab Disturbances
      Information as to and Measures taken to deal with, *May 13*, 615, 617, 618.
      Lalu Lajpat Rai, Circumstances of Arrest of, *May 29*, 1633, 1634.
      Rawal Pindi Riots, Cause of, *May 29*, 1633.
    State Prisoners, Regulations governing Confinement of, *May 13*, 612.
  Kew Gardens—Gardeners, Rate of Pay of, *May 23*, 1205.
  Natal British Indians, Trading Licences of—Complaints as to Administration of Law, *May 13*, 619.
  Trawlers Regulation Bill, Facilities for Passage of, *May 13*, 633.

**Rutherford, Mr. W. W.** [Liverpool, West Derby]
  Customs and Excise, Outdoor Staff, Conditions of Service of, *May 16*, 1137.
  Gravesend Water-guard Inspector, Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16*, 1124, 1125, 1128, 1129, 1130.
  Post Office Sites Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 279.

**Rutland**
  Parliamentary Election—New Writ issued, *May 29*, 1608.

**St. Helena**
  Condition of and Government Proposals for assisting Emigration.
    *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Churchill, *May 14*, 786, 787.

**St. Lucia**
  Riots, Information as to.
    *Q.* Mr. Mitchell - Thomson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8*, 216.

**St. Neots Urban District Council Bill**
  *l. Rep.* May 7*, 1.
    3R.* *May 14*, 733.
  *c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 766.
    2R.* *May 28*, 1460.

**Salmon**
  Scottish Fisheries which are Crown Property, Information as to.
    *Qs.* Mr. Summerbell; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 15*, 933, 934, 965.

**Salmon and Fresh Water Fisheries Bill**
Memorandum Presented, *May 28*, 1451.

**Salter, Mr. C.** [Hampshire, Basingstoke]
Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 286–292.

**Salterhebble**
*See under* Halifax.

**Samuel, Mr. H. L.**—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 294, 298.
Released Persons (Poor Law Relief) Bill, 2R. *May 24*, 1291.

**Samuel, Mr. S. M.** [Tower Hamlets, Whitechapel]
Aliens—Effect of Naturalisation in the Colonies on *Status* of Person in United Kingdom, *May 8*, 219.

**Sarawak**
Brooketon Collieries—Decision as to Tax.
*Qs.* Sir E. Sassoon; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 620, 621.

**Sassoon, Sir E. A.** [Hythe]
Finance Bill, 2R., *May 13*, 699–701, 717 720.
Fiscal Policy—Adaptation to Present Condition of National and Imperial Trade, Necessity for, *May 13*, 718–720.
Imperial Conference, 1907—Preferential Treatment, Attitude of the Home Government towards, *May 13*, 699–700.
Old-age Pensions, Government Proposals as to, *May 13*, 701.
Sarawak—Brooketon Collieries—Decision as to Tax, *May 13*, 620.
Youthful Offenders Act, Working of Inquiry into proposed, *May 13*, 633.

**Saughton Estate**
Re-instatement Claim of P. Collins.
*Q.* Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 7*, 50.

**Savings Banks**
*See* Post Office Savings Bank *and titles* Army and Navy.

**Scarisbrick, Mr. T. L.** [Dorset, S.]
Torpedoes—Number Manufactured in 1907 and Allocation of Contracts, *May 16*, 1092.

**Schwann, Sir C.** [Manchester, N.]
Post Office—Relatives of Supervising Officials, Rule as to Employing
Case of Telegraphist at Brighton, *May 10*, 462.
Date of Modifying, *May 16*, 1084.

**Scotland**
*Secretary for*—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
*Lord Advocate*—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
*Solicitor General.*—Mr. A. Ure.
[For particular places, *see their names.*]
Bazaar Raffles, Legality of.
*Qs.* Mr. Watt, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. C. E. Price, Mr. A. Cross; *As.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 9*, 369–371.
Crofters Commission Report, Date of Presenting.
*Q.* Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 16*, 1103.
Crofters' Holdings to which Act has been Applied—Fair Rents Fixed, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Cochrane; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 27*, 1330.
Education, *see that title.*
Estates and Treasure Trove, Administration of—Accounts Ordered, *May 9*, 336; Presented, *May 10*, 462.
Estimates, Date of Taking and Date of Issue of Certain Reports.
*Q.* Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 9*, 369.
House-letting System, Inquiry into—Date of Presenting Report.
*Qs.* Mr. R. Duncan, Mr. A. Cross; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 14*, 798, 799.
Result of Inquiry.
*Q.* Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 9*, 369.
Rental of Counties and Parishes, Value of Teinds, etc.—Return Presented, *May 9*, 334.
Sewage Purification Systems adopted by Burghs.
*Q.* Mr. R. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 14*, 770.
Slaughter-houses, Private, proposals for Abolishing.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 16*, 1103.
Ultimus Haeres—List of Estates Ordered, *May 9*, 336; Presented, *May 10*, 462.

**Scott, Archdeacon, Estate of**
Sale proposals for.
*Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 347.

**Scott, Sir S. E.** [Marylebone, W.]
Local Government Board, Messengers Appointed since 1906, *May 15*, 945.
London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 432.
Scots Greys, Arrangements for Quartering, *May 23*, 1154.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1547–1549.
Yeomanry—Decision as to Retention of Bayonet, *May 16*, 1094; *May 27*, 1307.

**Seaverns, Mr. J. H.** [Lambeth, Brixton]
- Brixton Land Tax Commissioners, Meetings of, *May 27*, 1296.
- Cuba—Claim of Messrs. Fowler against the Spanish Government, *May 27*, 1296.
- Customs Statistical Department—Conditions of Service of Assistant Clerks, *May 16*, 1138, 1140.

**Secretary of State for the Colonies.**
*Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.*

**Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs**
*Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.*

**Secretary of State for the Home Department**
*Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.*

**Secretary of State for India**
*Rt. Hon. J. Morley.*

**Secretary for Scotland**
*Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.*

**Secretary of State for War**
*Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.*

**Seddon, Mr. J. W.** [Lancashire, Newton]
- Liverpool Post Office Temporary Clerks—Conditions of Service, *May 9*, 401, 402.
- Post Office
  - Carmen, increase in Wages of, and Provision of Uniform for, *May 9*, 401, 405.
  - Typists, Women, increase in Salaries of, proposed, *May 9*, 402.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1531.

**Seely, Major, J. E. B.** [Liverpool, Abercromby]
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1490, 1558–1561.
- Transvaal—Distress in Rural Districts, Allegations as to and Proposals for dealing with, *May 13*, 623.

**Selsey Water Bill**
- *l.* 3R.* *May 8*, 198.
- *c.* 1R.* *May 13*, 568.

**Session**
*See under* Parliamentary Procedure.

**Settled Land Bill**
- *c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 804.

**Shackleton, Mr. D.** [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
- Education
  - Secondary, Condition of, lack of facilities, etc., Necessity for dealing with the Matter, *May 15*, 1050–1052.

**Shackleton, Mr. D.**—*cont.*
- Education—*cont.*
  - Training Colleges, Abolition of Sectarian Tests in, proposed, *May 15*, 1052.
- Irish Council Bill, Intro., *May 7*, 128–130.

**Shanghai**
- Morrow, Police Constable, Circumstances of Murder of and Proposals for Compensation for Relatives.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Runciman, Mr. Speaker, *May 13*, 626, 627.
- Municipal Gaol, Cause for Objections to Confinement in.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1316, 1317.

**Shanklin Gas Bill**
- *l.* 2R.* *May 15*, 921.

**Sharrow and Kirkby Malzeard Light Railway**
- Order Presented, *May 14*, 734, 769.

**Shaw, Rt. Hon T.**—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
- Bazaar Raffles, Legality of, *May 9*, 370, 371.
- Congested Districts Board Report, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1103.
- Crofters Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1103.
- Education Reports, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1102.
- Fisheries Report, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1103.
- Land Values (Scotland) Bill, Intro., *May 13*, 646–649.
- Local Government Report, Date of Presenting, *May 16*, 1103.
- Magistrates—Allegations as to Practice of adjudicating in Cases where Partners or joint Agents plead, *May 15*, 964.
- Meat Imported into Scotland, Inspection of, *May 16*, 1104.
- Prevention of Corruption Act—Complaints as to Evasions, *May 7*, 72.
- Slaughter-houses, Private, Proposals for abolishing, *May 16*, 1103.
- Swine, Irish—Inspection after Slaughter and before Export to Scotland, *May 16*, 1104.

**Sheehy, Mr. D.** [Neath, S.]
- Darnley Estate, Sale Proposals for—Case of J. Smith, *May 9*, 346.
- Dunshaughlin, Labourers' Cottages Scheme—Cause for Delay in issuing Loan, *May 9*, 339.

**Sheffield, Sir B.** [Lincolnshire, Brigg]
- Kilmore—Demonstration against Mr. S. Russell, *May 15*, 969.

[*cont.*

**Sheffield, Sir B.**—*cont.*
  Lincolnshire, Crime in—Condition of Brigg Division, *May 8*, 220.
  New Hebrides, Female Labour under Age—Estimate of Number available for Employment, *May 8*, 217.

**Shetland**
  Trawling Prosecutions—Grants to Fishermen Witnesses to Compensate for Loss of Time, proposed.
    *Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 27*, 1329.

**Shillelagh**
  Magistracy, Catholic Representation on, and Allegations as to uncertain Attendance
    *Qs.* Mr. James O'Connor; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 236, 237.

**Shop Hours Act**
  Orders made under, Presented, *May 9*, 335; *May 13*, 535; *May 16*, 1070, 1078.

**Shops (No. 3) Bill**
  *c*, 1R.* *May 7*, 78.

**Shoreditch**
  Condition of—Proposals for dealing with alleged Lawlessness.
    *Q.* Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 15*, 959.

**Shronowen**
  Reinstatement Claim of Mr. Mulvihill
    *Q.* Mr. Flavin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 14*, 780.

**Siam**
  Trade Report Presented, *May 16*, 1070.

**Sicily**
  Trade Report Presented, *May 13*, 534.

**Silcock, Mr. T. B.** [Somerset, Wells]
  Education
    Secondary
      Condition of, Lack of Facilities and Necessity for dealing with the matter, *May 15*, 1037–1039.
      Local Control, Extension of Principle of to all Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, proposed, *May 15*, 1037, 1038.
    Training Colleges, Abolition of Sectarian Tests in, proposed, *May 15*, 1037, 1038, 1039.

**Simon Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill**
  *l. Rep.** *May 7*, 1.
    3R.* *May 15*, 921.
  *c.* 1R.* *May 15*, 926.
    2R.* *May 28*, 1460.

**Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.**—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
  Crofter's Holdings to which Act has been applied—Fair Rents fixed, etc., *May 27*, 1330.
  Culloden Estate Evictions—Government Policy as to Scottish Leaseholders, *May 27*, 1331.
  Durness—Steamboat Service with Thurso, proposed, *May 28*, 1477.
  Education—Accountants Annual Report, expediting Publication of, proposed, *May 13*, 642.
  Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill, Second Reading, Date of taking, *May 29*, 1647.
  Embo Pier, Proposal for improving, *May 28*, 1477.
  Estimates, Date of taking and Date of issue of certain Reports, *May 9*, 369.
  Fisheries—Trawling, Illegal—Increase of Penalties, proposed, *May 27*, 1331.
  House-letting System, Inquiry into
    Date of Presenting Report, *May 14*, 799.
    Result of Inquiry, *May 9*, 369.
  Inverness-shire Sanatorium — Interdict, granted against Parish Council of Boleskine and Cleertarf, *May 14*, 799.
  Keiss School Teacher, Cause for Dismissal of, *May 28*, 1477.
  Lobsters, Close Time for — Reply to Memorial from Scottish West Coast Fishermen, *May 13*, 642.
  Moray Firth, Trawling in—Foreign Vessels reported and Number with British Crews, *May 8*, 225.
  Poor Law—Number of Persons in Receipt of Parochial Relief, *May 13*, 642.
  Salmon Fisheries which are Crown Property, Information as to, *May 15*, 934, 965.
  Sewage Purification Systems adopted by Burghs, *May 14*, 770.
  Shetland Trawling Prosecutions—Grants to Fishermen Witnesses, proposed, *May 27*, 1329.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill
    Expenditure by Authorities set up by the Bill, Provisions as to, *May 24*, 1257–1262.
      Agricultural Commissioners, Limiting Expenses in connection with to £5,000 per Annum, proposed, *May 27*, 1366.
    Land Court, Limiting Expenses in Respect of to £6,000 per Annum proposed, *May 27*, 1350.
    Operation of, *May 27*, 1330.

[*cont.*

**Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.**—*cont.*
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
Salaries, Authorising Payment of out of Consolidated Fund, *May 24*, 1257–1262.
Limiting Expenses in Respect of Agricultural Commissioners to £3,000 per annum, *May 27*, 1343.
Staff, Estimated Requirements and Cost, *May 24*, 1258.
Whale killing, Nuisance caused by—Effect on Herring Fishery, etc., *May 9*, 368, 369.

**Skipton**
Schools, Nomenclature of.
*Q.* Mr. Clough; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 9*, 364, 365.

**Sligo**
County Council Printing Contract, Decision of Local Government Board Auditor as to.
*Q.* Mr. Liddell; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 7*, 75.

**Small Holdings**
Act of 1892, Failure of.
*Os.* Mr. Walker, *May 8*, 312; Sir J. Kennaway, 314; Mr. Parker, 318; Sir E. Strachey, 329, 330.
Co-operation with regard to, Advantages of.
*Os.* Mr. Partington, *May 23*, 1183.
Crown Lands, Experiments with.
*Os.* Mr. Rogers, *May 8*, 307; Sir E. Strachey, 327–329; Mr. H. Beach, 332.
Demand for, Rents charged per Acre, etc.
*Os.* Mr. Rogers, *May 8*, 306; Mr. Walker, 312, 313; Col. Kenyon-Slaney, 323, 324; Sir E. Strachey, 326.
Demand for and Supplies available—Tabling Evidence in Parliamentary Papers proposed.
*Q.* Sir J. Randles; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 23*, 1166.

**Small Holdings and Allotments Bill**
*c.* Intro., *May 27*, 1377, 1414.
1R.* *May 27*, 1448.
*Debate on Introduction* [Commons], *May 27*, 1377.
Account to be opened at Bank of England by Board of Agriculture in connection with Small Holdings, 1383.
Audit of, Provision as to, 1383.
Treasury Contribution to Funds, 1383.
Acts of 1892 and 1887, Failure of, 1428, 1429, 1440, 1441.

**Small Holdings and Allotments Bill**—*cont.*
*Debate on Introduction* [Commons]—*cont.*
Allotments
Acquisition of Land for, Powers to be granted to Local Authority, 1383.
Definition of, 1382, 1421.
Erection of Buildings on, Provisions as to, 1384.
Necessity for distinguishing from Small Holdings, 1382.
Parish Council to be the Authority to deal with, 1382.
Amendment of existing Law aimed at, 1377, 1396.
Annual Report as to Progress made, Provisions for, 1383.
Buildings on Small Holdings, Difficulty of provding, 1402, 1403, 1447.
Combination of County Councils in Schemes of Value in Districts contiguous to County Boundary, 1383.
Commissioners and Sub-Commissioners to deal with administration of the Act, Proposals as to, 1380, 1424.
Committees and Sub-Committees to be Appointed by County Councils, 1384.
Co-operative Societies and Credit Banks, Power of County Councils to Establish, 1384, 1395, 1398, 1404, 1405, 1421, 1422.
Cost of Schemes, Powers of Board of Agriculture to Defray Preliminary Costs, 1381, 1390, 1441.
Definition of "Small Holdings," 1381.
Dual Ownership, Question as to, 1379.
Experimental Small Holdings, Power of Board of Agriculture to set up, 1383.
Land
Acquisition of by Borough Councils either by Agreement or Compulsion, Provisions as to, 1380, 1384, 1386, 1392, 1396, 1420, 1425.
Landlord to be given Powers to resume Possession at any time if required for Industrial or Building Purposes other than those of Agriculture, 1381.
Leasing of, Regulation of, 1380.
Limited Owners and Tenants-for-life, Powers as to disposal of Property, 1381.
Price, Fixing of, by Arbitrator, etc., 1380, 1381, 1445, 1446.

**Small Holdings and Allotments Bill**—*cont.*
  *Debate on Introduction* [Commons]—*cont.*
    Land—*cont.*
      Rent—No Allowance to be made for prospective use being a use for which Landlord is entitled to resume Possession, 1381.
    Loans, Provisions as to raising and Repayment of, 1382, 1390, 1420, 1439, 1441.
    Necessity for the Measure, 1378, 1389, 1407, 1415, 1435, 1440.
    Parks, Gardens and Pleasure Grounds, Immunity of, 1381.
    Report and Recommendations of Committee of 1905, 1379, 1384, 1394, 1426.
    Rural Depopulation, Increase in and Causes of, 1378.
    Sale of Leasing of Surplus Lands for Purposes Other than Small Holdings, Powers of County Councils, 1384.
    Security of Tenure, Provisions as to, 1379, 1388, 1415, 1424, 1428.
    Sheep Walks and Grazing, Power of County Councils to Acquire, 1383.
    Tenancy *v.* Ownership System, 1426, 1427, 1445.
    Tenants' Improvements, Compensation for, 1384, 1425.

**Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill**
  Expenditure by Authorities Set Up by the Bill, Provisions as to.
    *Os.* Mr. M. Ferguson, *May 24*, 1236–1242; Mr. H. Cox, 1244, 1245; Sir H. Craik, 1245–1247; Mr. Morton, 1250–1252; Mr. Cochrane, 1252–1257; Mr. Sinclair, 1257–1262; Lord Willoughby de Eresby, 1262; Mr. A. Smith, 1263, 1264.
  Agricultural Commissioners, Limiting Expenses in Connection with, to £5,000 Per Annum, proposed.
    *Os.* Mr. Rawlinson, *May 27*, 1363–1365; Sir F. Banbury, 1365; Mr. Sinclair, 1366.
  Land Court, Limiting Expenses in Respect of to £6,000 Per Annum, proposed.
    *Os.* Mr. Rawlinson, *May 27*, 1347–1349; Sir H. Craik, 1349; Mr. Sinclair, 1350; Mr. Long, 1350, 1351; Sir F. Banbury, 1351; Mr. Younger, 1352; Mr. J. F. Mason, 1353; Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 1353; Mr. Cochrane, 1354; Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, 1355; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1356–1359; Mr. Asquith, 1358; Captain Craig, 1359, 1360.

**Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill**—*cont.*
  Extension of Certain Provisions to England, Proposals as to.
    *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 16*, 1091.
  Operation of, as to Renouncement of Holdings and Readjustment of Rentals.
    *Q.* Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 27*, 1330.
  Salaries, Authorising Payment of, out of Consolidated Fund—Committee to Consider.
    *Resolution* [Mr. Sinclair] *May 24*, 1236; Reported, *May 27*, 1339.
      *Os.* Mr. Rawlinson, *May 24*, 1242–1244; Sir F. Banbury, 1247–1250; Mr. Sinclair, 1257–1262.
    Limiting Expenses in Respect of Agricultural Commissioners to £3,000 Per Annum.
      *Os.* Mr. Rawlinson, *May 27*, 1339–1342; Sir F. Banbury, 1342; Mr. Sinclair 1343; Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, 1344; Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 1344–1346.
  Staff, Estimated Requirements and Cost.
    *Os.* Mr. Cochrane, *May 24*, 1255–1257; Mr. Sinclair, 1258.

**Smeaton, Mr. D. M.** [Stirlingshire]
  Education Accountants' Annual Report, Expediting Publication of, proposed, *May 13*, 642.
  Grangemouth Telephone Service—Reason for Removal of Trunk Exchange to Falkirk, etc., *May 9*, 396.
  Japan—Qualifications of Medical Officers to British Embassy, at Tokio, *May 14*, 787.
  Vivisection Licences, Procedure in Granting, *May 15*, 960.

**Smith, Mr. A. H.** [Herts, Hertford]
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Expenditure by Authorities Set up by the Bill, Provisions as to, *May 24*, 1263, 1264.

**Smith, Mr. F. E.** [Liverpool, Walton]
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1495–1501.

**Smith, Mr. W. F. D.** [Strand, Westminster]
  London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 436–439.

**Smithfield Market**
  Post Office Premises, Cause for Delay in Improving.
    *Q.* Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 10*, 463.

**Smyrna**
  Brigandage near, Effect of Abbott Case on.
    *Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1317.

**Smyth, Mr. T.** [Leitrim, S.]
  Dick Estate—Reinstatement Claim of H. Sorahan, *May 10*, 467.
  Lauder and Gumley Estate—Reinstatement Claim of J. Daly, *May 9*, 371.

**Solicitor-General**
  *Sir W. S. Robson.*

**Solicitor-General for Ireland**
  *Mr. R. Barry.*

**Solicitor-General for Scotland**
  *Mr. A. Ure.*

**Soudan**
  Bahr-el-Ghazal—Date of Evacuation by Congolese Troops.
    *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 28*, 1471.

**South-Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railways Bill**
  *l.* 2R.* *May 8*, 197.

**Southend Water Bill**
  *c.* 2R.* *May 13*, 567.

**South Kensington Museum**
  Late Free Night on Thursday, proposed.
    *Q.* Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 29*, 1646.

**South Kensington Technical College**
  Incorporation
    Application for Charter, Presented, *May 7*, 3, 49.
    Proposals for Tabling Charter.
      *Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 7*, 69.

**Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill**
  *l.* 3R.* *May 8*, 198.
  *c.* 1R.* *May 13*, 568.

**Spain**
  Registered Letters not Delivered in—Result of Inquiry.
    *Q.* Mr. H. Heaton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 14*, 775.

**Speaker and Deputy Speaker, Rulings of**
  Colonial Delegates to Conference, Control over—Political Meeting addressed by Dr. Smartt, *May 16*, 1112.
  Cross-Examination of Ministers was out of Order, *May 29*, 1696, 1698.
  House could not be Counted Out between 8.15 and 9.15, *May 13*, 149.
  Interpolation in another Member's Speech was out of Order, *May 13*, 693.
  Irrelevant Matter, Introduction of, *May 8*, 251; *May 15*, 1027.

**Speaker and Deputy Speaker, Rulings of** *—cont.*
  Limited Partnership Bill—Stamp Duty Clause inserted without sanction of a Resolution in Committee—Recommittal of Bill, *May 15*, 1068.
  Relevancy of Argument to Subject under Discussion, *May 8*, 254.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Matter relevant to Financial Resolution, *May 27*, 1344, 1364.
  Supply, Proceedings in Committee having been terminated by a Count-out, Procedure as to Motion for setting up Committee afresh, etc., *May 25*, 1167.

**Spicer, Sir A.** [Hackney, Central]
  Bristol Poor Law Children sent to Muller's Orphanage, *May 27*, 1296.
  Hartley Wintney School Accommodation—Decision as to Enlargement, *May 24*, 1233.

**Standing Committees**
  *See under* Committees.

**Stanger, Mr. H. Y.** [Kensington, N.]
  Portsmouth Naval Gunnery Training Establishment Staff, Proposals for Reducing, *May 27*, 1306.
  Railways—Metropolitan District, Whistles and Sirens, Annoyance caused by, *May 14*, 776.

**State Banking Corporation Ltd.**
  Prosecution of Directors, Proposals as to.
    *Q.* Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 7*, 53.

**Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill**
  *c.* *Rep.** *May 9*, 333.
    3R.* *May 13*, 566.

**Staveley-Hill, Mr. H.** [Staffordshire, Kingswinford]
  Old Hill (Staffs) Post Office, Condition of, Arrangements as to Inspection, etc. *May 9*, 406, 407.

**Stepney**
  Parliamentary Area, Proportion of Foreign to British-born Voters in.
    *Q.* Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 8*, 221.
  Parliamentary Election—New Member sworn, *May 13*, 646.

**Stewart, Mr. H.** [Greenock]
  Customs Outdoor Staff, Conditions of Service of, *May 16*, 1135.

**Stornoway**
  *See under* Lewis, Island of.

**Strachey, Sir E.**—*Treasurer of the Household* [Somerset, S.]
  Anthrax—Scientific Experiments and In-Inquiries, Result of, *May 23*, 1201.

**Strachey, Sir E.**—*cont.*
Burwell Farm, Expenditure on, *May 7*, 71.
Cattle Importation Regulations, Effect of, *May 23*, 1194–1201, 1203.
Speech of Sir W. Laurier, etc., *May 13*, 640, 641.
Fruit Industry, Recommendations of Committee of 1905, Proposals as to Carrying out, *May 23*, 1201, 1202.
Hops Act of 1866
Administration of, Reason for non-application of to Foreign Hops, *May 23*, 1189–1192.
Application of Sections 5 and 6 to Imported Foreign Hops, *May 29*, 1647.
"Iverna," Live Animals carried by, on Passage of 11 June, 1906, *May 23*, 1157.
Kew Gardens
Assistant Director, Reason for Appointment of, *May 23*, 1206, 1207.
Employees, Wages of and Hours of Duty of Stokers, *May 15*, 963, 964.
Gardeners, Rate of Pay of, *May 23*, 1207, 1208.
Rural Districts, Depopulation of
Causes of, Statistics as to, and Necessity for dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 321–324.
Tariff Reform as a Remedy, *May 8*, 325.
Small Holdings
Act of 1892, Failure of, *May 8*, 329, 330.
Crown Lands, Experiments with, *May 8*, 327–329.
Demand for, Rents charged per acre, etc., *May 8*, 326.
Swine Fever—Restrictions on Movement of Swine, Order as to, *May 23*, 1192–1194.
Wiltshire Swine Fever Order of 1907, Relaxation of, proposed, *May 13*, 641.

**Straus, Mr. B. S.** [Tower Hamlets, Mile End]
Consols
Amount (2½ per cent.) in May 1906 and 1907, *May 15*, 957.
Government Purchases for Redemption Purposes, *May 27*, 1317.

**Street Betting Act**
Amendment of Act to deal with Facilities afforded for Betting in Factories, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 27*, 1320, 1321.
Effect of—Introduction of amending Legislation proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 13*, 634.

**Stuart, Mr. J.** [Sunderland]
Education, Secondary
Condition of, Lack of Facilities, etc. Necessity for dealing with the Matter, *May 15*, 1066.
Local Control, Extension of Principle of to all Secondary Schools and Training Colleges, proposed, *May 15*, 1067.

**Sugar Beet**
Brussels Convention, Adherence to essential for success of Sugar Beet Industry alleged.
*Os.* Earl of Denbigh, *May 13*, 548–550; Lord Denman, 553, 554; Lord Fitzmaurice, 559, 560.
Cultivation in British Isles—Establishment of Manufactories, Question of remitting Excise Duty, etc.
*Os.* Earl of Denbigh, *May 13*, 545–551; Lord Denman, 551–556, 558; Viscount Ridley, 556–559; Lord Fitzmaurice, 559.

**Summary Jurisdiction (Ireland) Bill**
Facilities for Passage of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 13*, 600, 601.

**Summerbell, Mr. T.** [Sunderland]
Kew Gardens
Assistant Director, Reason for Appointment of, *May 23*, 1205.
Employees, Wages of and Hours of Duty of Stokers, *May 15*, 962, 964.
Gardeners' Rate of Pay, Proposals as to increasing, etc., *May 23*, 1205, 1207.
Panama Canal—Conditions of Employing Trinidad Labourers, *May 7*, 60.
Salmon—Scottish Fisheries which are Crown Property, *May 15*, 933, 965.
Trinidad—Port of Spain Town Commissionership, Qualifications for, *May 7*, 59, 60.

**Sunday Trading (Scotland) Bill**
c. 1R.* *May 8*, 245.

**Superannuation**
Military Service of Civil Servants, Decision as to reckoning.
*Q.* Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 957.
Residence abroad, Regulations as to Payment of Pensions during.
*Q.* Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 29*, 1621.
Vote for, *May 16*, 1148.

**Supply**
*See* also *titles* Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, Navy Estimates.
Proceedings in Committee having been terminated by a count-out, Procedure as to Motion for setting up Committee afresh and reporting Resolutions, etc.
*Os.* Mr. Foster, *May 23*, 1166, 1167; Mr. Speaker, 1167.

**Supply of Electricity Bill**
Re-introduction, Proposals as to.
*Q.* Mr. H. Morgan; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 13*, 637.

**Supreme Court of Judicature**
*See under* Law Courts.

**Surgeons, Royal College of**
Management, Reply to Memorial on.
*Q.* Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 13*, 601, 602.

**Sutherland, Mr. J. E.** [Elgin Burghs]
Bazaar Raffles, Legality of, in Scotland, *May 9*, 370.

**Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 7*, 48.
2R.* *May 24*, 1229.

**Swansea Harbour Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 8*, 197.

**Swaziland**
Cession of Portion to Transvaal, Negotiations for.
*Q.* Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 15*, 939.
Policy as to—Changes contemplated in Order of December, 1906.
*Q.* Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 15*, 952.

**Sweden and Norway**
Treaty in substitution for that of 1855, Progress of Negotiations for.
*Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 14*, 788.

**Swindon**
Poor Law Guardian sleeping one night in Casual Ward and being Declared as Disqualified thereby—Action proposed to be taken.
*Q.* Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 9*, 360.

**Swine**
Irish—Inspection after Slaughter and before Export to Scotland.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 16*, 1103, 1104.
*Q.* Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 28*, 1478.

**Swine Fever**
Expenditure in Connection with, Increase in.
*Os.* Mr. Carlile, *May 23*, 1210.
Restrictions on Movement of Swine, Inconvenience caused by.
*Os.* Mr. Rogers, *May 23*, 1175; Sir F. Banbury, 1176, 1193; Mr. Everett, 1186; Sir E. Strachey, 1192–1194.

**Swinford**
Poor Law Guardians, Charges against.
*Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 8*, 239, 240.

**Taff Vale Railway Bill**
*l.* 2R.* *May 8*, 197.

**Taxation**
Basis of, Necessity for Broadening.
*Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 651–654, 659; Mr. M'Kenna, 665, 666; Mr. E. Cecil, 672, 673; Mr. Lyttelton, 691; Mr. Buxton, 721–728; Mr. C. Money, *May 14*, 813–818; Mr. Lane Fox, 818–822; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 824–830; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 842–845; Mr. Asquith, 852, 853; Mr. Bridgeman, 857–859; Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 866–869; Mr. B. Law, 897–902; Mr. M'Kenna, 901; Mr. Runciman, 907–912.
Income Tax, *see that title.*
Local
  Account, Proposals as to Alteration in.
  *Q.* Mr. Harmood-Banner; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 7*, 66.
  Assigned Revenue Intercepted fro the Exchequer, proposed Abolition of System.
  *Os.* Mr. H. Beach, *May 8*, 274, 275; Mr. Harmood-Banner, 275–277; Mr. Asquith, 277.
  Grants from Consolidated Fund. Resolution Reported, *May 8*, 274.
  Irish Account, Payments to (1901–5).
  *Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 978.
  Returns, Expediting Publication of, proposed.
  *Q.* Mr. Dickinson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 8*, 222, 223.
Return as to Rates of Duties, Taxes or Imposts Collected by Imperial Officers—Ordered, *May 14*, 770.
War Taxes, Possibility of Remitting.
*Os.* Mr. S. Roberts, *May 8*, 245, 246; Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 662.

**Taximeter Cabs**
*See under* Cabs.

**Taylor, Mr. A.** [Liverpool, E. Toxteth]
Irish Council Bill., Intro., *May 7*, 100, 162–167.
Scottish Grand Committee, Procedure before, Verbatim Report of, proposed, *May 15*, 1030, 1031.

**Taylor, Mr. J. W.** [Durham, Chester-le-Street]
Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 503–505.

**Teachers of Music Registration Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 9*, 375.

**Tees Conservancy Bill**
*c. Rep.* May 14*, 766.

**Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 7*, 48.
2R.* *May 23*, 1150.

**Teinds, Scotland**
*See* Scotland—Rental of Counties, etc.

**Telegraph Service**
[*See also names of places.*]
Boy Messengers, New Policy with regard to—Proposals as to Displacement of Ex-soldiers.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 385–387, 416; Sir F. Banbury, 393, 394; Mr Wilkie, 404; Col. Lockwood, 411, 412.
Clerical Duties, System of Instructing Telegraphists in.
*Q.* Mr. A. Dewar; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 8*, 204.
Communication with the Colonies and Foreign Countries, Necessity for Remedying Anomalies of present System.
*Os.* Mr. H. Heaton, *May 9*, 390, 391.
Girl Telegraphists, System of Appointing in Country Districts.
*Os.* Mr. Weir, *May 9*, 424, 425.
Money issued out of Consolidated Fund for Purposes of Acts, 1863–1906—Committee to Consider, *May 10*, 532.
Race Meetings, Expenditure Due to.
*Os.* Mr. Morton, *May 9*, 409.
Rural Districts, Increasing Facilities in proposed.
*Os.* Mr. Morton, *May 9*, 409; Mr. Buxton, 416.
Scotland—Underground Wires, Progress made with Laying.
*Os.* Mr. A. Bryce, *May 9*, 392; Sir F. Banbury, 392, 393; Mr. M. Ferguson, 397; Mr. Crombie, 402, 403; Mr. Wilkie, 404, 405; Mr. Morton, 408, 409, 417; Mr. Buxton, 416–419, 428; Mr. M'Crae, 421; Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, 423.
Telegrams, Foreign and Colonial, Facilities for, Transmission of by Steamer from Ports.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 380.

**Telephone Service**
[*See also names of places.*]
Charges, Excessive Nature of.
*Os.* Sir G. Parker, *May 9*, 400; Mr. Buxton, 415.
Effect of in Superseding Telegrams and Letters.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 376, 377.
Extension, Progress made with.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 377.

**Temporary Laws**
Register Presented, *May 15*, 928.

**Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill**
*c. Com., May 28*, 1481; *May 29*, 1707.
Auxiliary Forces Permanent Staff, Proposals as to.
*Q.* Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 7*, 55.
*Debates in Committee* [Commons], *May 28*, 1481; *May 29*, 1707.
County Associations, Proposals as to, 1526, 1562.
Expenditure
Army Council as Central Body to deal with, Objections to, 1708–1716.
Moneys received by Associations outside of War Office Grants, Provisions as to, 1727–1732.
Power of Army Council to allow an Association to apply Money to other Purposes than those Specified to be Subject to Treasury Approval, proposed, 1721–1727.
Treasury Approval for Statement of Requirements of Associations, proposed, 1716–1720.
Militia
Abolition of, Objections to, 1507–1511, 1513–1516, 1523, 1532.
Conditions of Service and Rates of Pay under the Bill, 1498, 1506, 1528, 1529.
Exemption of, from Operation of the Bill, proposed, 1495–1535.
Foreign Service, Liability for under New Scheme, 1532–1534.
History and Services of the Force, 1495–1498, 1502.
Present state of the Force, 1503–1505, 1517, 1518.
Omission of Sub-section 4 of Clause 3, proposed, 1727–1732.
Second Line or Territorial Force, Proposals as to, 1512, 1521–1525.
Representation of, at the War Office, Proposals as to, 1484.

[*cont.*

**Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill**—*cont.*
- *Debates in Committee* [Commons]—*cont.*
  - Special Reserve Battalions, Proposals as to, 1510.
  - Specifying Auxiliary Forces by Name, as Militia, Yeomanry and Volunteers, proposed, 1481–1492.
  - Yeomanry
    - Exemption of, from Operation of the Bill, proposed, 1537–1568.
    - Organisation of under New Scheme, Alteration of Rates of Pay, etc., 1543–1568.
- Expenses, Authorising Payment of Out of Money Voted by Parliament
  - *Resolution* [Mr. Haldane], *May 28*, 1579; Reported, *May 29*, 1657.
- Expenses Resolution Debate, *May 29*, 1657.
  - Adjutants, Estimate for, 1668, 1682, 1683, 1692, 1695, 1702.
  - Approximate Estimate of Cost, 1658, 1664, 1691.
  - Bounties, Decision as to, 1669, 1684, 1700.
  - Camp Allowances, Estimates for, 1666, 1677, 1683, 1692, 1698, 1701.
  - Capitation Grant, proposals as to, 1659.
  - Control over Finances of County Associations, proposals as to, 1660, 1661, 1671, 1672, 1674, 1675, 1676, 1680, 1682, 1684.
  - Depôts and Drill Halls, Old and New, Proposals as to, 1689, 1696, 1700.
  - Divisional-Generals, Estimate for Pay of, 1693.
  - Drill Halls, Compensation to be Paid for, 1659.
  - Method of Payment to County Associations, 1659, 1681, 1682.
  - Parliamentary Control, Necessity for Maintaining, and Proposals as to, 1661–1664, 1670–1673, 1678–1681, 1684–1687, 1690, 1695, 1703, 1704.
  - Second Suit of Clothes, Item for, 1658, 1667, 1668, 1694, 1698, 1699.
  - Sergeant-Instructors, Proposals as to Retaining Services of, 1692, 1693.
  - Supplementary Estimate, 1658, 1664, 1665, 1676.
  - Total Cost of Territorial Army, Possibility of Collecting into One Vote, 1687–1689.
  - Transfer of Money Allocated from One Purpose to Another, Objections to System, 1662–1664, 1671, 1674, 1686, 1687, 1691, 1695.
- Financial Provisions of.
  - *Q.* Colonel Long; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 16*, 1089.
  - Paper 3370—Proposals for Referring to Public Accounts Committee.
    - *Qs.* Mr. V. Cavendish; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 29*, 1629.

**Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill**—*cont.*
- Revised Estimates and Memoranda, Date of Tabling.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 16*, 1095.

**Thomas, Mr. D. A.** [Merthyr Tydvil]
- Coal Mines, Inquiry as to Hours of Labour in—Date of Issuing Report, *May 14*, 790.
- Dinas Powis School, Condition of, *May 28*, 1475.
- Education (Popular Control) Bill, Intro., *May 15*, 983.
- Schools in Wales and Monmouthshire which do or do not receive Assistance from the Rates, *May 14*, 797.

**Thomas, Sir A.** [Glamorganshire, E.]
- Irish Council Bill, *Intro.*, *May 7*, 153.

**Thorne, Mr. W.** [West Ham, S.]
- Cartridges Seized at Newcastle—Sentence on J. Hogarth, *May 16*, 1085.
- Local Government Board Pension System—Case of Senior Assistant Clerk, *May 16*, 1099.
- Police, Metropolitan—Local Authorities giving Weekly Day of Rest, *May 29*, 1641.
- Russian Social Democrat Conference—Allegation as to Police Espionage, etc., *May 27*, 1319.
- Swindon Poor Law Guardian Sleeping One Night in Casual Ward and being Declared as Disqualified thereby—Action proposed to be taken, *May 9*, 360.

**Thornton, Mr. P. M.** [Clapham]
- Land Tax—Regulations as to Exemption of Friendly Societies, *May 9* 356.

**Tobacco**
- Ireland—Government Assistance towards Cultivation.
  - *Os.* Earl of Denbigh, *May 13*, 546, 551, 554; Lord Denman, 554, 558; Viscount Ridley, 557, 558.

**Tonkin**
- Railways—Arrangement for Conveyance of British Goods and Preferential Treatment Accorded to French Goods on Railways and Steamers.
  - *Q.* Sir F. Cawley; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 14*, 788.

**Torrance, Sir A. M.** [Glasgow, Central]
- Indian Factory Labour, Conditions of—Result of Inquiry, *May 28*, 1465.

**Toulmin, Mr. G.** [Bury, Lancashire]
- Finance Bill, 2R., *May 14*, 876–886.
- Fiscal Policy
  - Colonial Preference, Question of—Advantages Offered by the Colonies, *May 14*, 881–886.

[*cont.*

**Toulmin, Mr. G.**—*cont*
Fiscal Policy—*cont.*
Industries of the Country, Effect of Free Trade System on, *May 14*, 877–879.
Merchant Shipping, Effect on, of Change in Fiscal System, *May 14*, 880.

**Trade, Board of**
*President*—Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.
*Parliamentary Secretary.*—Mr. H. E. Kearley.
Labour Department, Functions of, as to Assisting Workmen to find Work.
*Qs.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 7*, 68.

**Trade Reports**
Annual Series Presented, *May 7*, 2, 49; *May 8*, 202; *May 9*, 335; *May 13*, 534, 569; *May 14*, 734, 769; *May 15*, 922, 927; *May 16*, 1070, 1078; *May 23*, 1151, 1152; *May 24*, 1231; *May 28*, 1450, 1453, 1462.
Miscellaneous Series Presented, *May 23*, 1152; *May 28*, 1451.

**Trade and Commerce**
British Possessions and Foreign Countries—Statement (1906) Presented, *May 24*, 1230; *May 28*, 1452.
Inter-Imperial Trade, Proposals for Promoting.
*Qs.* Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 627.
Machinery Classification in Annual Statements, Improvement in, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Forster; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 23*, 1163.

**Tralee**
Constabulary Barracks, Telephone Extension to, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 15*, 939.

**Transvaal**
British Indians
Conditions of Registering.
*Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 7*, 61.
Correspondence Relating to Legislation Affecting, Expediting Tabling of.
*Os.* Lord Ampthill, *May 29*, 1586; Earl of Elgin, 1596.
Transvaal Registration Bill, Restrictions imposed by, Attitude of His Majesty's Government towards, etc.
*Os.* Lord Ampthill, *May 29*, 1586–1591; Earl of Elgin, 1591–1597; Marquess of Lansdowne, 1596–1599.
Chinese Labour Question.
*Os.* Mr. J. Ward, *May 15*, 1028.
Opium, Conditions of obtaining.
*Q.* Colonel Harrison-Broadley; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 23*, 1162, 1163.

**Transvaal**—*cont.*
Chinese Labour Question—*cont.*
Policy of Colonial Government.
*Qs.* Captain Craig, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 15*, 952, 953.
*Q.* Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr Churchill, *May 15*, 954.
Repatriations effected and Payment of Expenditure.
*Qs.* Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 15*, 952, 953.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 16*, 1080.
Unlicensed Coolies
Circumstances of Admission of.
*Os.* Mr. Walsh, *May 15*, 1017–1019; Mr. Mackarness, 1020, 1021; Mr. Churchill, 1021–1024; Mr. Lyttelton, 1024–1026.
Cost of Repatriating.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 16*, 1080.
Position of and Measures taken to deal with.
*Qs.* Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Herbert; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 624.
Loan of £5,000,000 guaranteed by His Majesty's Government, Conditions of granting.
*Os.* Lord Ampthill, *May 29*, 1591.
*Qs.* Sir J. Leese, Mr. Dalziel; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 9*, 355.
*Q.* Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 13*, 632.
Date on which Guarantee was promised to General Botha.
*Q.* Mr. Lane-Fox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 15*, 954.
Objects to which applied.
*Q.* Sir F. Banbury; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 16*, 1080.
Mines—Cause of Strike of White Miners.
*Q.* Mr. J. Ward; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8*, 218.
Imperial Troops, Authority for employing to keep order—Number sent, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. Wedgwood, Mr. Lea, Mr. Mackarness, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. J. R. Macdonald, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Haldane, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *May 27*, 1308–1312.
*Qs.* Mr. Mackarness, Mr. Lea, Mr. P. Pease, Mr. Walsh, Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 29*, 1636–1638.

[*cont.*

**Transvaal**—*cont.*
Mines, etc.—*cont.*
Information as to.
*Q.* Mr. Mackarness; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 624, 625.
Rural Districts, Distress in, Allegations as to and Proposals for dealing with.
*Qs.* Major Seely, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 13*, 623, 624.
Volunteer Force, Proposals for raising.
*Q.* Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 607, 608.

**Trawlers Regulation Bill**
Facilities for Passage of.
*Qs.* Mr Morton, Dr. Rutherford; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 633.

**Trawling**
*See under* Fisheries.

**Treasurer of the Household**
*Sir E. Strachey.*

**Treasury**
*First Lord*—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
*Financial Secretary*—Mr. W. Runciman.

**Treasury Bills**
Amount outstanding on 10th instant.
*Q.* Mr. Bryce; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 631, 632.

**Trevelyan, Mr. C. P.** [Yorks, W.R., Elland]
Charity Lands, Sale of—Case of St. Mary's Hospital, Chichester, *May 13*, 576.
Hereford—Scudamore Charity, Administration of—Proposals as to Inquiry, *May 9*, 367.

**Trinidad**
Panama Canal, Labour for, *see* Panama Canal.
Port of Spain Town Commissionership Qualifications for.
*Qs.* Mr. Summerbell; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 7*, 59, 60.

**Truro-Helston**
Land Tax Commissioners Act, Alleged Evasion of.
*Q.* Mr. Hay Morgan; *A.* Mr. Runcmian, *May 16*, 1099.

**Tuberculosis**
Recommendations of Royal Commission, Proposals for giving effect to.
*Q.* Sir F. Channing; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 13*, 639.

**Tuke, Sir J. B.** [Edinburgh and St. Andrews Universities.]
Vaccination Bill, 2R., *May 24*, 1271–1274.

**Tullamore**
Whisky Frauds—Decision as to Prosecution, etc.
*Q.* Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 643.
*Q.* Mr. H. Burke; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 15*, 934, 935.
*Q.* Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 27*, 1300.

**Turkey**
Salonica—Abbott Case—Position of Negotiations for Repayment of Ransom.
*Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 15*, 955.
*Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 27*, 1317.
Trade Reports Presented, *May 7*, 2; *May 28*, 1451.

**Turnour, Lord,** [Sussex, Horsham]
Alien Immigration Officers, Information as to Work done by, *May 16*, 1136.
Athenry—Outrage on Constable O'Halloran, Arrests made, etc., *May 15*, 970.
Castlefrench—Outrage at Farm of J. Burns, etc., *May 16*, 1110.
Condition of Ireland—Facilities for Parliamentary Discussion, etc., *May 15*, 980.
Customs and Excise—Reserve Soldiers and Sailors, Number employed, *May 16*, 1136, 1137.
Imperial Conference, 1907.
*Précis* of Speeches, Responsibility for' *May 16*, 1097, 1098.
Reports of Speeches, Responsibility for, *May 13*, 573.
Irish Grazing Farms under Police Protection, *May 15*, 978.
Loughrea—Disturbances at certain Grazing Farms, Arrests made, etc., *May 15*, 970.
Mall to Charing Cross, Date for Completion of, *May 7*, 70.
Panama Canal, British Emigrants employed at—Rate of Sickness, etc., *May 15*, 956.
Parliamentary Elections—Legislative Proposals for dealing with Returning Officers' Fees, *May 16*, 1111.

**Tyne Improvement Bill**
*c.* 2R.* *May 14*, 765.

**Tynemouth Corporation (Water) Bill**
*l.* Report from Select Committee, *May 8*, 197.
3R.* *May 14*, 733.
*c.* 1R.* *May 14*, 766.

**Unemployed**
Expenditure on Relief.
*Q.* Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 28*, 1475.

[*cont.*

**Unemployed**—*cont.*
Vote, Expenditure out of.
*Q.* Captain Craig; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 15*, 980.

**Union Jack Club**
Controller of, Application for Appointment of Officer in the Indian Army.
*Os.* Lord Rosmead, *May 16*, 1073; Earl Beauchamp, 1074.

**United Methodist Church Bill**
*l.* 3R.* *May 8*, 198.
*c.* 1R.* *May 13*, 568.

**United States**
British and German Vessels, Passengers carried by (1904–6).
*Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 27*, 1322.
Concessions granted to Germany.
*Q.* Mr. Forster; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 23*, 1164.
Trade Reports Presented, *May 7*, 2; *May 13*, 534; *May 14*, 734; *May 28*, 1450, 1451.

**University Colleges**
Grant, Allocation of.
*Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 9*, 366.
Report of Inspectors, Date of Tabling.
*Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 9*, 366.

**Urpeth Colliery**
Explosion—Report Presented, *May 14*, 734, 769.

**Vaccination**
Conscientious Objection—Legislation to assimilate Practice with that existing under Education Laws, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 632.
Officers, Alteration in Basis of Payment of, proposed.
*Q.* Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 15*, 943.

**Vaccination Bill**
*c.* 2R., *May 24*, 1271.
Compensation for Vaccination Officers, proposals for.
*Q.* Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 8*, 205, 206.
Statutory Declarations, Fees chargeable for.
*Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 7*, 68.

**Vagrancy**
Recommendations of Committee, Date of giving effect to.
*Os.* Mr. P. Pease, *May 23*, 1216; Mr. Gladstone, 1222.

**Valentia, Viscount** [Oxford]
Medical Inspection of Schools, Proposals for, *May 9*, 344.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1537–1542; *May 29*, 1713–1716.

**Valuation**
Quinquennial Re-valuation — Postponement in view of extra Work entailed by New Budget, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 13*, 591.

**Valuation Bill**
Introduction, Proposals as to.
*Q.* Mr. Hay; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 7*, 69.

**Valuation (Scotland) Bill**
Date of Introducing
*Q.* Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 8*, 203, 204.

**Verney, Mr. F. W.** [Bucks, N.]
Old-age Pensions Bill, 2R., *May 10*, 521-523.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1551.

**Victoria and Albert Museum**
Arrangement and Organisation—Appointment of Advisory Committee.
*Q.* Sir W. Anson; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 7*, 69.

**Vincent, Colonel Sir C. E. H.** [Sheffield, Central
Army—Territorial Forces
Cost of, *May 28*, 1468.
Walking-out Uniform, Provision of, *May 13*, 605.
Cumberland—Police Promotion System, Legality of, *May 8*, 220.
Imperial Conference, 1907
Mackay, Sir H., Circumstances of Attendance of—Authority for Statements on Preference, etc., *May 8*, 210, 211.
Proceedings, Proposals for Publication of—Dissatisfaction with Abridgements issued by Colonial Office, etc., *May 8*, 211, 212.
Publication of Proceedings *in extenso*, Decision as to, *May 13*, 622.
Kew Gardens Employees, Wages of and Hours of Duty of Stokers, *May 15*, 963, 964.
Magistrates, Ireland—Returns as to Previous Occupations, proposed, *May 10*, 467.
Public Demonstrations, Cost of, Inconvenience caused by, and Police employed in regulating, *May 15*, 958, 959.

**Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H.**—*cont.*
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1484.
  - Auxiliary Forces Permanent Staff, Proposals as to, *May 7*, 55.
  - Expenses Resolution, *May 29*, 1683, 1691–1694.
- Trade and Commerce—Inter-Imperial Trade, Proposals for promoting, *May 13*, 627.
- Transvaal Mines—Strike of White Miners, Employment of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 29*, 1637.

**Vivisection**
- Experiments—Return as to Number, etc., during 1906, Ordered. *May 9*, 336; Presented, *May 13*, 569.
- Licences, Procedure in granting.
  - *Q.* Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 15*, 960.

**Volunteers**
- Artillery, Proposals as to under New Scheme.
  - *Qs.* Captain Faber, Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 14*, 783.
- Crossan, Gunner, Decision in Case of.
  - *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 610.
- Equipment, Cause for Delay in considering.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 27*, 1308.
- Retired—Conditions for joining Territorial Force.
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 16*, 1090.
- Special Contingent, Inducements to Join.
  - *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 16*, 1089, 1090.

**Voters Lists**
- Expenditure in Preparing — Power of Borough Councils to restrict Town Clerk.
  - *Q.* Mr. Dickinson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 8*, 223.

**Walker, Mr. H. De R.** [Leicestershire, Melton]
- Imperial Conference, 1907—Attitude towards Irish Home Rule, *May 8*, 214.
- Land Purchase Stock, Correct Designation of, *May 15*, 946.
- Rural Districts, Depopulation of
  - Causes of, Statistics as to, and Necessity for dealing with the Question, *May 8*, 308–314.
  - Farm Products, Encouragement of, proposed, *May 8*, 309.
- Small Holdings
  - Act of 1892, Failure of, *May 8*, 312.
  - Demand for Rents charged per Acre, etc., *May 8*, 312, 313.

**Walrond, Mr. L.** [Devon, Tiverton]
- Berkhamsted Grammar School Scheme, Rights of Ratepayers under, *May 29*, 1621.
- Post Office Estimates—Allowance made for Depreciation in Value of Building, etc., *May 29*, 1613.
- Post Office Savings Bank
  - Interest, Education in to Prevent Deficiency, proposed, *May 13*, 591.
  - Limit of £200
    - Accounts exceeding, through Accumulation of Interest—Return, proposed, *May 13*, 592.
    - Extension of, proposed, *May 13*, 593.

**Walsh, Mr. S.** [Lancashire, S.W., Ince]
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labourers—Circumstances of Admission of Coolies without Licences, *May 15*, 1017–1019.
  - Mines—Strike of White Miners, Employment of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 29*, 1637, 1638.

**Walton, Sir J. L.**—*Attorney-General* [Leeds, S.]
- Berkhamsted Grammar School Scheme, Rights of Ratepayers under, *May 29*, 1622.
- Criminal Appeal Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 284, 285, 293.
  - Effect of Clause 12, *May 27*, 1328, 1329.
- Land Registration System, Revision of, proposed, *May 27*, 1326.
- Land Transfer Act, 1897, Working of, in London, *May 27*, 1299.
- Law Courts—King's Bench Division Cases standing for Trial in, *May 27*, 132`, 1328.

**War Office**
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
- *Parliamentary Under-Secretary*—Earl of Portsmouth.
- *Financial Secretary*—Mr. T. R. Buchanan

**Ward, Mr. J.** [Stoke-on-Trent]
- British Museum Reading Room, Redecoration of, Contract Stipulations as to sub-letting of Piece-work, *May 13*, 640.
- Business of the House, State of and Proposals as to, *May 15*, 1028–1030.
- Egypt, raising of Assouan Dam
  - Nationality of Workmen employed, *May 13*, 625.
  - Source of Payment of Cost and Firm entrusted with Work, *May 7*, 62.

[*cont.*

**Ward, Mr. J.**—*cont.*
- Imperial Conference, 1907—*Precis* of Proceedings, Publication of and Responsibility for making, *May 13*, 621.
- London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 458, 459; *May 27*, 1407–1409.
- Merchant Shipping (Deduction for Propelling Powers) Bill—Effect on Powers granted to certain Authorities as to levy of Dues, *May 15*, 961.
- Panama Canal, British Emigrants employed at
  - Rate of Sickness, etc., *May 15*, 955, 956.
  - Records kept and Measures for Protection of, *May 13*, 619.
- Public Demonstrations, Inconvenience caused by and Police employed in regulating, *May 15*, 959.
- Session, Duration of, *May 15*, 1028–1030.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1491.
- Transvaal
  - Chinese Labour Question, *May 15*, 1027, 1028.
  - Mines—Cause of Strike of White Miners, *May 8*, 218.
    - Imperial Troops, Use of, etc., *May 27*, 1310.
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharged Workmen
  - Emigration, Authority for giving advice as to, *May 13*, 606.
  - Reconsideration of Decision proposed, *May 7*, 58.

**Warde, Col. C. E.** [Kent, Medway]
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1552–1554.

**Warden Estate**
- Evicted Tenants, Cause for Delay in Reinstatement of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 7*, 72.

**Waring, Captain W.** [Banffshire]
- Irish Council Bill—Grant, Source of Providing, *May 9*, 373.

**Wason, Mr. J. C.** [Orkney and Shetland]
- Australasian Naval Squadron—Understanding as to Colonial Contribution, etc., arrived at in Conference, *May 13*, 603.
- Ballinskelligs Bay, Trawling in—Services of "Helga," etc., *May 15*, 969.
- Cattle—Importation of live Cattle, Restrictions on—Speech of Sir W. Laurier, etc., *May 13*, 640.
- Commons and Right of Way—Cases in which Local Authorities have interfered to protect under Act of 1894, *May 9*, 360.

**Wason, Mr. J. C.**—*cont.*
- Imperial Conference, 1907, Australasian Naval Squadron, Understanding as to, *May 13*, 603.
- Marine Biological Association Committee, Decision as to, *May 13*, 632.
- Motors
  - Accidents during last six Months, *May 27*, 1318, 1319.
  - Speed Tests on Public Roads, Regulation of—Frome's Hill Case, *May 27*, 1323, 1324.
- Shetland Trawling Prosecutions—Grants to Fishermen Witnesses proposed, *May 27*, 1329.
- Transvaal
  - Loan, Procedure in Guaranteeing, *May 13*, 632.
  - Mines—Strike of White Miners, Use of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 27*, 1310.
- Whale Killing, Nuisance caused by—Effect on Herring Fishery, etc., *May 9*, 368, 369.

**Waterlow, Mr. D. S.** [Islington, N.]
- London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 444–446.

**Watt, Mr. H. A.** [Glasgow College]
- Companies—Unclaimed Dividends notified in Balance Sheets, Measures for Payment of, proposed, *May 28*, 1472.
- Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill—Inquiry, Inclusion of Scottish Representative, proposed, *May 8*, 221.
- Education (Provision of Meals) (Scotland) Bill—Date of taking Second Reading, *May 29*, 1647.
- Gravesend Water-guard Inspector—Reason for Appointment of Naval Officer, *May 16*, 1123.
- Income Tax
  - Three Years Average System, Working of, etc., *May 7*, 65.
  - Unearned Incomes, Rate to be Levied on, *May 7*, 65.
- Kilcreggan—Particulars of War Office Purchase of Land, *May 29*, 1627.
- Magistrates, Scottish—Allegations as to Practice of Adjudicating in Cases where Partners or Joint Agents plead, *May 15*, 964.
- Meat Imported into Scotland, Inspection of, *May 16*, 1104.
- National Debt Office, Salaries, Explanation of Increased Estimate for, *May 16*, 1120.
- Navy
  - Obsolete Vessels
    - Conditions of Sale of and Proposals for utilising, *May 9*, 349, 350.

[*cont.*

**Watt, Mr. H. A.**—*cont.*
- Navy—*cont.*
  - Obsolete Vessells—*cont.*
    - Value of certain Vessels if sold without Conditions as to Breaking up, *May 14*, 781.
    - Vessels in the Holy Loch, Original cost of and price obtained for, *May 8*, 207.
  - Rosyth, Price paid for—Names of Valuators, etc., *May 7*, 57.
- Prevention of Corruption Act, Scotland, Complaints as to Evasions, *May 7*, 71.
- Slaughter-houses, Private, in Scotland, Proposals for abolishing, *May 16*, 1103.
- Swine, Irish—Inspection after Slaughter and before Export to Scotland, *May 16*, 1103; *May 28*, 1478.

**Wealth**
- Distribution of.
  - *Os.* Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 13*, 652, Mr. Bottomley, 687; Mr. C. Money, 815, 816.

**Wedgwood, Mr. J. C.** [Newcastle-under-Lyme]
- Africa, West
  - Deep-water Landing Places, Ownership of, *May 9*, 354.
  - Rails and Sleepers, Arrangements for Shipping—Freight charged, etc., *May 9*, 353, 354; *May 23*, 1161.
- Canada, Steamship Lines to—Effect of new Scheme for Subsidised Line, etc. *May 2*, 1313.
- Education
  - Board—Proposals as to Medical Department, *May 15*, 962.
  - Medical Inspection of Schools, Proposals for, *May 9*, 364.
- Liquor Traffic—Result of Inquiry as to Children taken into Public Houses, *May 28*, 1474.
- Naval Base at Rosyth, Price paid for—Names of Valuators, etc., *May 7*, 57.
  - Value of surrounding Land, Effect of Establishment of Dockyard on, *May 9*, 351.
- New South Wales unimproved Land Value, Legislative Proposals for Rating, *May 14*, 800.
- Nigeria—Railway Material, Procedure in placing Orders for Freight, *May 9*, 354.
- Post Office Mail Service, All-British Scheme—Provision as to Coaling of Ships, *May 23*, 1162.
- Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1445–1447.
- Transvaal Mines—Strike of White Miners, Use of Imperial Troops, etc., *May 27*, 1308, 1309.

**Weights and Measures Act**
- Final Regulations, Date of Issue of and Cause for Delay.
  - *Q.* Dr. Hazel; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 7*, 67.

**Weir, Mr. J. G.** [Ross and Cromarty]
- Culloden Estate Evictions—Policy of the Government as to Scottish Leaseholders, *May 27*, 1331.
- Estimates, Scottish, Date of taking, and Date of issue of certain Reports, *May 9*, 369.
- Fisheries—Increase of Penalties for Illegal Trawling, proposed, *May 27*, 1331.
- India
  - Cantonment Act, 1899, Amendment of, proposed, *May 29*, 1629.
  - Cantonment Magistrates, Duties and Powers of, *May 29*, 1630.
  - Railways—Bombay-Sind Line, Correspondence and Memorial as to Cutch Route, *May 29*, 1629, 1631.
- Post Office Savings Bank, Telegraphic Withdrawals, Working of System, *May 9*, 424.
- Stornoway Mail Service, Improvement of, proposed, *May 9*, 425, 428.
- Telegraph Service—Girl Telegraphists, System of Appointing in Country Districts, *May 9*, 424, 425.

**Wemyss, Earl of**
- Territorial Army—Postponement of Notice of Motion relating to, *May 14*, 762.

**West Ham**
- Workhouse and Infirmary—Cost of Alcoholic Liquors consumed (1905–7).
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Nicholson; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 13*, 586, 588.

**West Indies**

(*See also Names of Islands*).
- British Naval Vessels for Service in—Decision as to additional Cruiser.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 8*, 217.
- Mail Service Subsidy, Proposals as to.
  - *Os.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, *May 9*, 424; Mr. Buxton, 427.
- Sugar Production and Export (1900–1905)—Return Presented, *May 23*, 1152.

**West Yorkshire Tramways Bill**
- *c.* *Con.** *May 13*, 566.
  - 3R.* *May 16*, 1075; *May 23*, 1150.
- *l.* Commons Amendts., *Con.** *May 28*, 1450.

**Westley Estate**
- Sale Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 27*, 1304, 1305.

**Westmeath**
Untenanted Land in Delvin and Mullingar Districts.
*Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 13*, 594.

**Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewarage Board Bill**
*c.* 1R.* *May 7*, 48.
2R.* *May 23*, 1150.

**Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill**
*c.* *Rep.** *May 9*, 333.
3R.* *May 13*, 566.

**Wexford**
County Council Grant, Deductions from (1900–1907.)
*Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 27*, 1303.

**Whale-Killing Fisheries**
Nuisance caused by killing of Whales—Effect on Herring Fishery, etc.
*Qs.* Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. J. Dewar; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 9*, 368, 369.

**White, Mr. G.** [Norfolk, N.W.]
Congo Free State, Belgian Administration, Charges of ill-treatment of Natives—Responsibility of Great Britian, etc., *May 15*, 1005–1009.

**White, Mr. J. D.** [Dumbartonshire]
Colonial Imports in United Kingdom' Duty paid on in 1906, *May 13*, 637.
Dalmuir Level Crossing, Fatality at—Erection of Bridge, proposed, *May 27*, 1323.
Government Property, Rates on, Assessment Method adopted for, *May 16*, 1114.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1448.
Sub-Postmasters in Shops, Conditions of Service of, *May 9*, 422, 423.
Vaccination Bill—Statutory Declarations, Fees chargeable for, *May 7*, 68.
Valuation (Scotland) Bill
Date of Introducing, *May 8*, 203.
Delay in Printing, Cause for, *May 29*, 1656.

**White, Mr. L.** [Yorkshire, E.R., Buckrose]
Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 710.

**White, Mr. P.** [Meath, N.]
Agriculture Department—Constitution of Agriculture Board, Council of Agriculture and Technical Instruction Board, *May 15*, 977.
Education Grants from Consolidated Fund or out of Revenue, (1901–5), *May 16*, 1101.

**White, Mr. P.**—*cont.*
Irish Council Bill
Electoral Divisions, Basis for Distributing, *May 16*, 1089.
Financial Provisions, *May 15*, 976.
Irish Treasury, Proposals for Control of *May 15*, 976.
"Iverna," Live Animals carried by, on passage of 11th June, 1906, *May 23*, 1157.
Kellet's Estate, Purchase Proposals for, *May 16*, 1109.
Local Government Board, Administrative Cost of (1903–6) and Amount paid to, in relief of Local Taxation, *May 16*, 1101.
Lord-Lieutenant and Chief Secretary, Powers of, as to Appointments and Dismissals in certain Departments, *May 15*, 977.
Scott, Archdeacon, Estate of, Sale Proposals for, *May 9*, 347.
Taxation, Local—Payments to Irish Account (1901–5), *May 15*, 978.
Whitepark—Reinstatement Claim of J. Dunn, *May 9*, 347.

**Whitehead, Mr. R.** [Essex, S.E.]
Education—Absence through Illness, Effect of, on Grant, *May 28*, 1476.
Workmen's Trains, Issue of Tickets from Gray's and Tilbury, proposed, *May 28*, 1466.

**Whitepark**
Reinstatement Claim of J. Dann.
*Q.* Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 9*, 347, 348.

**Wiles, Mr. T.** [Islington, S.]
London Municipal Society, Subscription to, by South Metropolitan Gas Company, *May 14*, 791.
Post Office Pension and Superannuation System, Information as to, *May 9*, 405.
Privilege Cab System, Progress of Negotiations as to, *May 9*, 357.

**Wilkie, Mr. A.** [Dundee]
Dundee Telegraphists' Grievances, *May 9*, 404.
Post Office
Associations, Recognition of as Trade Unions, *May 9*, 403, 404.
Boy Messengers, New Policy with Regard to—Proposals as to displacement of Ex-Soldiers, *May 9*, 404.
Newspaper Postal Rates, Anomalies of, *May 9*, 404.
Public Service Board to deal with all Questions relating to, Establishment of, proposed, *May 9*, 404.

[*cont.*

**Wilkie, Mr. A.**—*cont.*
Telegraph Service in Scotland—Underground Wires, Progress made with laying, *May 9*, 404, 405.

**Williams, Mr. W. L.** [Carmarthen District]
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Intro.*, *May 27*, 1419–1421.

**Willoughby de Eresby, Lord** [Lincolnshire, Horncastle]
Butter and Margarine Bill, 2R., *May 8*, 281.
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, *Intro.*, *May 27*, 1442–1445.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—Expenditure by Authorities set up by the Bill, Provisions as to, *May 24*, 1262.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1544; *May 29*, 1728.

**Wilson, Mr. A. S.** [Yorks, E.R., Holderness]
Hull, Dock Dredgings, Detriment caused by, place of Deposit of, *May 28*, 1474, 1475.
London—Accidents caused by Motors and by Horse-drawn Vehicles during last Six Months, *May 27*, 1318.
Moray Firth, Trawling in
British Subjects in Subordinate Positions on Foreign Vessels, Reason for Prosecution of, *May 8*, 244.
Foreign Vessels reported and Number with British Crews, *May 8*, 225.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *Com.*, *May 28*, 1491, 1549–1551.

**Wilson, Mr. J. W.** [Worcestershire, N.]
Kingston-upon-Hull, Corporations Bill, *Con.*, *May 13*, 711.

**Wiltshire**
Charities—Return Presented, *May 22*, 1295.
Swine Fever Order of 1907, Relaxation of, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Rogers; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 13*, 641.
Wimbledon Parliamentary Election—New Member Sworn, *May 28*, 1478.

**Winfrey, Mr. R.** [Norfolk, S.W.]
Small Holdings and Allotments Bill, Intro., *May 27*, 1392, 1428–1437.

**Wireless Telegraphy**
Licences Issued to British Companies—Date of Ratification of Convention, etc.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 377.

**Wisbech Water Bill**
*l. Rep.* May 29*, 1585.

**Women**
Local Authorities, Service on—Proposals for Legislation.
*Q.* Mr. Radford; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 13*, 638.

**Wood, Mr. T. M.** [Glasgow, St. Rollox]
London County Council (Electric Supply) Bill, 2R., *May 9*, 433–436.

**Woolwich Arsenal**
Admiralty Contracts Allotted to.
*Q.* Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 611.
Discharged Workmen
Emigration, Authority for giving Advice as to.
*Qs.* Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 606, 607.
Reconsideration of Decision proposed.
*Qs.* Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. J. Ward; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 7*, 57, 58.
Gun-mountings, Allocation of Contracts for.
*Qs.* Mr. Bellairs, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 611.
Inquiry, Scope of.
*Q.* Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 13*, 582, 583.
Labourers' Wage, Minimum of.
*Q.* Mr. Crooks; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 16*, 1091.
*Q.* Colonel Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 29*, 1627.
Minimum Staff, Decision as to.
*Q.* Viscount Helmsley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 15*, 947.

**Workhouses**
Construction of—Code Issued by Local Government Board.
*Q.* Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 15*, 943, 944.

**Workmen's Compensation Act**
Casual Workmen, Definition of—Issue of Circular proposed.
*Q.* Mr. L. Haslam; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 28*, 1466.
Industrial Diseases, Extension to—Order Presented, *May 27*, 1294; *May 28*, 1453.
Insurance Against, Facilities for Effecting Through the Post Office.
*Os.* Mr. Buxton, *May 9*, 381.

**Workmen's Trains**
Grays and Tilbury, Issue of Tickets from, proposed.
*Q.* Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *May 28*, 1466.

**Works Board, Ireland**
*See under* Ireland.

**Works, Office of**
Estimate, Cause for Increase in.
*Q.* Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *May 15*, 963.

*May 7—May 29.*

**Worthing Gas Bill**
l. 2r.* *May 15*, 921.

**Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. S.** [Sheffield, Hallam]
Probation of Offenders (No. 2) Bill, 2r., *May 8*, 296.

**Yeomanry**
Armament—Decision as to Bayonet.
*Q.* Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 27*, 1307, 1308.
Bayonet, Decision as to Retention of.
*Q.* Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. J. A. Pease, *May 16*, 1094.

**Yorkshire**
Polling Districts in West Riding, Order Altering, Presented, *May 14*, 735, 769.

**Young, Mr. S.** [Cavan, E.]
Cavan Land Appeal Cases—Date of giving Decisions, *May 7*, 54.

**Younger, Mr. G.** [Ayr Burghs]
Oban Post Office, Site for, *May 29*, 1643.
Small Land Holders (Scotland) Bill—Land Court, Limiting Expenses in Respect of to £6,000 per Annum, proposed, *May 24*, 1352.

**Youthful Offenders**
*See* Juvenile Offenders.

**Youthful Offenders Act**
Working of, Inquiry into, proposed.
*Q.* Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 13*, 633.

**Yoxall, Mr. J. H.** [Nottingham, W.]
Education
Secondary
Condition of, Lack of Facilities, etc., Necessity for Dealing with the Matter, *May 15*, 1063, 1064.
Grants, Additional, Proposals as to, *May 15*, 1063.
Training Colleges—Sectarian Tests, Abolition of, proposed, *May 15*, 1062.

**Zambesi**
Victoria Falls, Conditions of Concession made at.
*Q.* Mr. Essex, Sir G. Parker, Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 14*, 784, 785.

**Zoological Gardens**
Feeding of Pythons on Live Animals, Allegations as to.
*Q.* Mr. G. Greenwood; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 9*, 358.